

11. E. c
Against the Revolt to //

A Foreign Jurisdiction,

Which would be to *England* its *PERTURB*
CHURCH-RUINE. and *SLAVERY*.

In Two Parts.

I. The History of Mens Endeavors to introduce it.

II. The Confutation of all Pretences for it.

Fully stating the Controversie, and Proving, That there is no Sovereign Power of Legislation, Judgment and Execution over the whole Church on Earth, Aristocratical or Monarchical, but only Christs: Especially against the Aristocratists who place it in a Council or College.

By *RICHARD BAXTER*, an Earnest Desirer of the Churches Concord, and therefore an Enemy to all false Terms, and Dividing Engines, and Self-exalting Sects; and a Defender of Christ's own assigned Terms, which take in all the true Christians in the World, and are Injurious or Cruel to none.

To be offered to the next Convocation, beseeching them to own the Doctrine of Foreign Communion, but to note with Renunciation the Doctrine of Foreign Jurisdiction, and to Vindicate the Reformed Church of *England*, from the Guilt and Suspicion which the French and Innovators injuriously seek to fasten on them.

Luk. 22. 24, 25, 26. And there was a strife among them which of them should be accounted the Greatest: And he said to them, The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them, and they that exercise Authority upon them are called Benefactors: But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the Younger; and he that is chief as he that doth serve.

1 Thess. 5. 12. We beseech you Brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, 13. And to esteem them very highly in love for their work sake; and be at Peace among your selves.

London, Printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Ten in Cross-street at the lower end of Chancery, near Mercers Church. 1691.

2.3.11



2

To the Reverend and deservedly Honoured
Dr. JOHN TILLOTSON
Dean of St. *Paul's* Church.

Reverend Sir,

TH E Message on which this Epistle cometh to you is, to intreat you to Present this Treatise to the next Convocation, and to endeavour their publick renunciation of Foreign Jurisdiction, and their censure of the Books that are written here for it. The Reasons of my request are,

I. The Canons condemn them, that deny the Convocation to be the Church of *England* Representative: And they that have written for and promoted this Doctrine and Design,

The Epistle Dedicatory.

have not only been Chief Men in the Church, but have laboured to fasten their Doctrine on the Church, which yet before the time of Bishop *Laud*, the Church disclaimed and openly condemned; and took Foreign Bishops and Councils, for Brethren and a laudable means of Communion, while they did their proper work, but not by Jurisdiction to be the Governours of us, and all Christian Kings and Kingdoms as their Subjects. And who can be Ignorant, that when at the present the Papist Bishops are very Many to One Protestant Bishop, they will accordingly carry it by their Votes in Councils: And if the Major Vote be the *Collegium Pastorum*, that have the Chief Government in the Interval of Councils, we are now Subjects to the Bishops and Church of *Rome*: And if the Roman *Petrus Primus* must call the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the next Council, (or there must be none till all Christian Kings agree to call it) the present College is like to be long the Universal Aristocracy.

The Representative Church of *England* is so nearly concerned in this great Matter, both for the moment of it, and the imputation of this Design unto it, that we cannot think they will lightly pass it by without their censure.

Which will be the more expected because of the Owning of Dr. *Beveridge's* Sermon to them, which I have here examined.

Dr. *Whitby's* *Reconciler of Protestants* escaped not the *Oxford* censure; and we hope the Representative Church of *England*, will not be more favourable to *Subjection*, which is more than *Reconciling* to the *Foreign Papists*: Lest they cher-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

rish the Suspicion that the desire of so much Concord with *France* in Church Constitution and Government, will intimate a preparation to another Relation to them, which *England* cannot bear with ease.

And we are loth to be disabled to confute the Separatists, that will never be reconciled to the Church of *England*, if they can say that it is revolted to a Subjection to the Papists.

But why should we doubt whether the Convocation will renounce that which both themselves and all the Church and Kingdom are Sworn against, even all Ecclesiastical Foreign Jurisdiction.

II. The Reasons why I presume to desire you to be the Man that shall present this Book and Motion to them, Are 1. Because it is said that Custom maketh the Dean of

Pauls

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Pauls usually to be chosen the Prolocutor to the Lower House. I speak but by hearsay having never been one of them: (For the Clergy of *London* choosing Mr. *Calamy* and Me for their Clerks, of that Convocation that made the Materials of the late differencing *Impositions*, Bishop *Sheldon* by Prerogative excluded us to our great Ease: and so the City of *London* consented not by their Clerks to any of those Acts.)

2. And you are the Man that Published that Excellent Book of Dr. *Isaac Barrow*, which unanswerably (against Mr. *Thorndike* and such others) confuted the Pretences to a Foreign Jurisdiction.

3. And you are known to be so firm a Friend to Love, Concord and Peace, (like your Father in Law Bishop *Wilkins*, who once by appointment treated, and agreed with us in

The Epistle Dedicatory.

a *Uniting Form of Concord*) that I may confidently expect your best Assistance.

If any should be so adverse to this Necessary Work as to turn it off by diverting to Accusation against me, or the Nonconformists, I pray tell them how impertinent that is to the present Business: And if it be needful, shew them my *Treatise for National Churches*, and that of *Episcopacy*; and my *English Nonconformity stated and argued*: And whereas I am said to have refused a Bishoprick because I was against Episcopacy, be it known that in 1661, the Pacificators never offered any thing lower than Archbishop *Usher's Model of the Primitive Episcopacy*: And when the King's Declaration granted us less, we Published a thankful Acceptance. And I gave Writing the Reasons of my Refusal

The Epistle Dedicatory.

refusal to the Lord Chancellor *Hyde*,
That If that Declaration were Confirmed
by a Law, I would be no Bishop, because
I would not disable my self to perswade
as many as I could to Conformity, by
drawing them to say that I did it for my
own Ends. Which Answer satisfied
the Lord Chancellor. I think every
Bishoprick in *England* hath Buried
many of its Bishops since my refusal;
who am now near Dying in the
76th Year of a Painful Life; and in-
treat you though I be Dead to
do this Office, for the Endangered
Church of *England*, and for your
truly honouring Brother,

Ri. Baxter.

TO

TO THE
READER.

THis Book being Written at several times, most of it many Years ago, and some lately, and answering many Persons who use the same Arguments, it hath one blemish which I am ashamed of in the review: that is, The too oft repeating the same things; especially in my four Letters to Bishop Gunning, occasioned by our oft repeating them in Conference. The thing is usual in long Disputations, (as in the Schoolmen, in Dr. Twisse Vind. Grat. and such others, the Adversary making it needful;) But I am far from justifying it: Had I intended it as one orderly Treatise at first, and not written the
Parts

To the Reader.

Parts on several Occasions, or had I yet Time and Strength to have cast it into a more regular shape, it might have been partly amended: But I had rather it came out thus than not at all: Whoever is displeased at it, by guilt or different judgment, I will please my Conscience, whose Peace I find possible and quietting, while such Mens hath been neither hitherto to me.

I know that Age and Natural Weakness, hath been part of the Cause of my forgetting oft that I had written the same before. But while I confess this Infirmary, I will tell the Reader two Stories for his use of it.

I read in a great Man that oft repeating in the Pulpit the same thing, was a sign to the Hearers, that their Teacher spake not crudely and rashly that he had never digested or well studied, nor light things that he valued not: but that which he thought necessary and had long considered.

To the Reader.

I heard of a Preacher that would needs have his Servant tell him what Men said of his Preaching: And being asked (but loth) he said, They say, Sir, that you very often repeat the same things; And so tell you the truth, I think it is too true: For the last Day you repeated that which you had said divers Days before: Saith his Master, Tell me what it was? He Paused a while, and said, I remember not the words now: Saith his Master, Didst thou so understand them as to tell me the Matter and meaning of them? But he could tell neither: Nay then, saith his Master, I will repeat them yet again for thy sake, and such as thou art: Till they are understood and remembered I have not said them oft enough. God be merciful to us Sinners.

THE CONTENTS

Of the First Part.

AN Historical Preface.

Chap. I. *The Protestant Church of England is against all Humane Universal Sovereignty, Ad-marchical and Aristocratical, and against all Foreign Jurisdiction.*

Chap. II. *This whole Kingdom and Church is sworn against all Foreign Jurisdiction, and against all Endeavours to alter the Government; and must not be Perjured.*

Chap. III. *What Endeavours were used by Papists to bring England under a Foreign Jurisdiction in King James's time. The Bishop of Ambrun and others wrong him.*

Chap. IV. *Of the Papists Endeavours in K. Charles time, and the great Injury they did him especially the Irish. Maimburgh Declaration of the Bishops of York.*

Chap. V. *The Foreign Leaders of the English Conci-liators who are for a Foreign Jurisdiction. Gerson for the sufficiency of Christ's Law to rule the Church.*

Chap. VI. *Grotius's Judgment in his own words.*

Chap. VII. *The several sorts of Peace-makers about Popish Controversies.*

Chap. VIII.

The Contents.

Chap. VIII. *The Doctrine of Archbishop Bromhall defending Grotius.*

Chap. IX. *The Judgment of Archbishop Laud, as delivered, 1. By Dr. Heylin. 2. By himself.*

Chap. X. *Dr. Peter Heylin's own Judgment.*

Chap. XI. *The Judgment of Mr. Herbert Thorndike.*

Chap. XII. *The Judgment of Dr. Sparrow Bishop of Norwich, and divers others.*

Chap. XIII. *Bishop Sam. Parker's Judgment.*

Chap. XIV. *Dr. Saywell's Arguments for a Foreign Jurisdiction considered.*

Chap. XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII. *Four Letters to Bishop Guning about a Foreign Jurisdiction.*

Chap. XIX. *Mr. H. Dodwell's Leviathan again Anatomized; and his Second Part considered, called A Discourse for One Altar and One Priesthood.*

Chap. XX. *Of Dean Th. Pierce (and Dr. Hammond cited by him.)*

Chap. XXI. *That this sort of Prelatists who have been for a Coalition with the French or Roman Church, have been the great Agents of all the Dividing, Silencing, Persecuting Laws, which have brought and kept us these 27 Years in our lacerate State.*

Chap. XXII. *How they have been stopt, and what Danger there is yet of them.*

Chap. XXIII. *Postscript against Dr. Beveridge's Convocation Sermon.*

CHAP.

An Historical Prologue, as a Key to understand our English Differences.

§ I. **I**T is a dreadful Instance of the sottish de-
ceivableness of Mankind, that one of the
most happy Kingdoms on Earth, should
be almost consumed by their own hands,
in Divisions infamous through the World, and
that to this very day the *Cause* and *Matter* of them,
is not known (except by the contrivers, among
our selves) by such who madly continue the Di-
visions. Nor is it known who is in the fault, but
they strive on, accusing one another. And it's one
of the saddest notices in this World, that studi-
ous Learned Pastors that are grown old in Studies,
and profess all to be devoted to Truth and Love,
are so far from having skill and will to heal us, that
they are the men that cause the wound, and keep
it open, and are greater hinderers of our Concord
and Peace, than Princes, Lords, or any Seculars :
And what one judgeth the certain Cause of the
Worlds Divisions, another as confidently judgeth
the only way to heal them : And both sides con-
fess while they lay it on each other, that it is the
Clergy that are the deadliest Enemies of Peace.

§ II. It is not the noise of Drums and Trum-
pets, which tells an Army the causes of the War :
The Masters of the War can chuse their own
Trumpeters, and talk loudest of that which they
would have divert men from the true cause. Epif-

copacy, and Liturgy, and Ceremonies, and Conformity, are the things that make the greatest noise. But *Jewel, Bilson, Hooker, &c.* differed not about these, nor Sir *Edwin Sandys*, the Author of *Europe Speculum*: Nor the English Clergy and Parliaments in Bishop *Abbots* days, who were of their mind, when the Differences began to rise and threaten us.

§ III. It's certain that the fundamental, universal Quarrel through the World, is between the followers of *Cain* and *Abel*, the Serpents and the Womans Seed, or the Servants of Satan and of Christ: For the carnal mind is enmity to God, and neither is nor can be subject to his Law. *Selfishness* is the sum of wickedness; and Holiness of Moral good. Uniting in one God is possible and safe: But to the *selfish* there are as many Religions and Ways, as sandy self-interest requireth. Good men will do good, and bad men will do evil, under every Form of Government: Because Great-Good men are so rare, to keep Bad men from doing hurt, is not the smallest use of Laws. Good men of different Opinions can live in Love and Peace. I never knew any called Puritanes, who did not love and honour such Conformists, as Bishop *Jewel*, A. Bishop *Grindal*, A. Bishop *Abbot*, A. Bishop *Usher*, Bishop *Davenant*, and many such; and such as Mr. *Belton*, Dr. *Sibbs*, Dr. *Preston*, Mr. *Whateley*, and all such other; yea while they wrote against some of them (as Bishop *Morton*, *Hall*, *Downname*, &c.) But what are the particular Quarrels?

§ IV. Departing from the only Center and Test of Universal Concord, and devising an *Universal Humane Sovereignty*, hath set the World in-

to mortal Discord, on pretence of being the only way to Concord. Christ only is the Head, the King, and Law-giver, and Judge of the whole World: The Law of Nature, and sacred inspired Apostolical Scriptures, are his only Universal Law. Pastors by the Word, and Princes by the Sword (conjoynd where it may be) rule under him only in their severall Provinces. God made the largeness of the Roman Empire a Receptive Means of the happy propagation of Christianity. Mans nature is prone to selfishness and ambition: By degrees those humours, and the Wisdom of the World, conformed the Episcopal Government to the Civil, and made those Bishops highest, who dwelt in the Cities where the Secular Rulers were highest. The Churches had before used to serve God in Concord, and to Assemble for Consultation when Concord required it. The Emperors therefore exalted the great Bishops, not to Govern alone, but to preside in these Assemblies. The first General Council had been called as a rational means to cure the shameful threatening Discords of the Churches, without the formality of any President, save the Emperor and a temporary Moderator: But three Patriarchs were soon set up, and after made five, and other Bishops in different degrees of grandeur: The great and shaking dangers bred by Religious Factions, were ordered to be decided by Assemblies of Bishops, when changes were made in the Cities of the Empire, the Rule of conforming the Church to the Civil Government bred a competition between *Rome* and *Constantinople*, because of the translating of the Imperial Seat. They grew higher and higher; and whenever any Emperor

of *Constantinople* fell out with his own Patriarch, he either put him out, or favoured the preheminance of the Bishop of *Rome* to curb him : But usually his own Bishop being at his command, he favoured his Interest against the Roman : And it being the Law of their Councils called General, that the five Patriarchs must be there, by themselves, or their Delegates, and the Emperors calling the Councils (upon great occasions) they called them in some Eastern City for the most part, and the main Body of the Councils were the Greek Bishops, very few of the Western being there, nor the Pope himself, nor at *C. P. Conc.* 1. so much as any Legate.

When the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who was the third, fell out with him of *Constantinople*, he would extol the Roman Preheminance to strengthen himself: And when the East had *Arian* persecuting Emperors and Bishops, the Orthodox would fly for countenance to the Orthodox Emperor and Bishop in the West : But usually the other four Patriarchs in Councils concurred, and the Roman Clergy were a small part of their Councils.

But these Councils dolefully disagreeing, became a Church Militant, and on pretence of agreeing, the Churches tore them all to pieces, and all upon two occasions : 1. WHO SHOULD BE GREATEST, or please the greatest for worldly Interest? 2. WHO SHOULD PASS FOR ORTHODOX, when after the *Arian* and *Macedonian* Heresies, much of the strife was about ambiguous words: Till at last the Division of the Churches, the Degeneracy of the Clergy, the Badness of Emperors, and the Rebellion of Generals,

als, and Mutinies of Souldiers, delivered up the Empire to the Infidels. And the Bishop of *Rome* became the Chief Rebel, and set up the French in the Western Empire, against his Lawful Prince, and furthered the Division of the Empire to its Ruine. But this Division occasioned an Universal Claim.

§ V. In all the old Contests it never came into the mind of the Emperors or the Councils, to set up a Government over all the World, but only in the Empire: They never Summoned the Bishops of all the World but only of the Empire (and not most of them.) As I have oft said, The Subscriptions yet tell us that it was the Bishops of the *Roman* Provinces. But the Empire being large, they used sometime the swelling phrase of *totius Orbis*, meaning *Orbis Romani*: And the Greek Patriarchs never dreamed of a *Jus Divinum*, or Establishment by Christ, or his Apostles, much less of an Universal Power: For they all knew that *Constantinople* had no such pretence, being a new Erected Seat; And they were not so impudent as to profess to set a Humane Law against a Divine: And the *Roman* Bishop long went no higher, nor ever used that Argument against *Constantinople* [*My Power is of God and yours but of Men*] which had been most obvious and unresistible, and therefore would have been used, had it been true and then believed.

But at last, from the Name of Saint *Peter's* Successor, the Pope began a double new Claim.

1. TO A DIVINE RIGHT. 2. TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ALL THE WORLD (of Christians at least.) And the breaking of the Empire necessitated him to this pretence which

his ambition had obscurely before begun. For
 else, 1. His old power had died, when he was
 no Member of the Empire, and so from under
 the ancient Government and Laws: And all must
 have been built on a new uncertain Foundation.
 2. And when all the old Eastern Empire was
 gone, his Power and Primacy would have been
 confined to a narrow compass. VVherefore he
 served his present interest; 1. By setting up the
French Empire, and 2. By pretending to a right
 of Universal Sovereignty over the VVorld as the
 Successor of *St. Peter*.

For a General hath no strength without his Ar-
 my, who must have their Part in the Fight, the
 Victory, and the Prey: Popes always ruled but
 in and by these Councils: These therefore must,
 as Church Parliaments have their Power in the
 Universal Sovereignty, and the Pope as Universal
 Monarch must Rule not absolutely; but in and
 by these Law-makers and their Laws.

How this Land was brought to Popery by de-
 grees, and how much the most Religious Men
 did towards it, I must not tell Historically lest I
 be too long. He that readeth but *Beda*, and
Malmesbury, and *Huntington*, and *Hoveden*, and
Matthew Paris, may see how the *Roman Grandeur*
 drew on the change, and how good people took
 the advancement of the Bishops in Wealth and
 Power, and the Number and Endowments of
 Monasteries to be the chief strength of the Chri-
 stian Church, while Princes were hardly restrain-
 ed from Rapacity, Sacriledge, and from the
 Crimes that commonly breed in worldly Power,
 Wealth and Pleasure. The wickedness of some
 Princes made the Power of the Prelates seem ne-
 cessary

cessary to bridle them: And then better Princes took it for their Chief Piety to advance them, who were all taken for *sacred Persons, Men of God*: And after the *Saxons* overthrow of the *Brittains*, the Countrey being Heathens, and long in Converting, it must needs be that ignorance must be predominant for a long time: And the Cure of it was greatly hindered by the continual Wars of the *Saxon* Kings among themselves, and after by the *Danish* Wars and Conquest.

And under the *Normans* the Bishops were grown so strong by their dependance on the Pope, who was then grown to the height of his Usurpation, as that they were almost in continual Contests with their Kings. The Ignorance of the English Clergy was so great that the Kings were put to fetch their chief Bishops from other Lands, where they had got more learning than was found at home, and so had been trained up in the height of Popery: And even those that were the most Famous for Learning and such Piety as then prevailed, were yet most Zealously addicted to the Pope, and learnt of *Rome* to strive for Grandeur.

Wilfrid of *York* who is magnified by *Malmesbury* and others after *Beda*, was so zealous to be the sole Bishop in that large Northern Countrey, when the King and the A. Bishop of *Canterbury* said there was work enough for four, and decreed a division, that in resistance of the King and the A. Bishop he appealed to the Pope, and went divers times himself to *Rome*, and once at Seventy years of age, rather than have his vast Bishoprick divided.

And when by his better skill in Computation he prevailed against the Holy Scots for the Roman time of *Easter*, the Merit of that, and that he was the first that brought in singing by *Antiphons*, and the Benedictine Monckery were good works which he pleaded against diminishing his Bishoprick: *W. Malmesbury*, p. 151.

The most Learned were placed at *Canterbury*, *Viz*, *Odo*, *Dunstane*, specially *Lanfranke*, *Anselme*, &c. whose Miracles by the Monks are magnified beyond belief, which tended much to advance their Interest. But what the generality of the Bishops were long, judge by these words of *Malmesbury de gest. Pont. li. 1. p. 116*. [speaking how *Sigandus* got both the Bishopricks of *Winchester* and *Canterbury*, and how Sacrilegious and Wicked a Life he lived, selling Bishopricks and Abbies, of unbounded Ambition and Covetousness, adds, [*Sed ego conjicio illum non judicio sed errore peccare, quod homo illiteratus (sicuti pleriq; & pene omnes tunc temporis Anglia Episcopi) nesciret quantum deliquerit, rem Ecclesiasticorum negotiorum sicut publicorum actitari existimans,*] that is, [But I conjecture that he sinned not knowingly but by error ; That being an Illiterate Man, (as most and almost all the Bishops of England then were) he knew not how much he transgressed ; thinking that Church matters were to be managed like Publick matters.] (that is secular.) And this was in good *K. Edward's* Reign, and at the Conquest. And is it any wonder if such Bishops brought in Popery. And though the Conqueror strove not till he was settled, he and his Son after him were fain to be resolute in defending themselves against their own Prelates and the Pope : And though *Hen. 1.* wisely ordered them,

the

the Bishops that had Sworn to be true to the Em-
press his Daughter, broke their Oath, and after
swore to K. Stephen against her, and brake that
Oath, and sware to her again, and brake that
Oath, and again turned to Stephen, and his own
Brother the Bishop of Winchester led the way:
And no wonder when they were great enough, to
Build suddenly the many great Castles, (*Sherburne,*
Salisbury, Devizes, Malmesbury, &c. which he sur-
prized.) And when *Hen. 2.* succeeded Stephen
after long bloody VVars, with the greatest ad-
vantage of a Powerful Government, yet was he
not able to master his own Bishops strengthened
by the Pope. VVho feared not openly to tell
him as *Thomas of Canterbury* did, [*Certum esse Re-*
ges potestatem suam ab Ecclesia accipere, & non ipsam
ab illis sed à Christo, &c. Hoveden, Hen. 2.
p. 285.]

§ VI. But the General and his Army, the Uni-
versal Church-Monarch and his Church-Parlia-
ment could not well agree. Many hundred years
the Roman Church-Monarch having the Prefer-
ments in his power, got Councillors to his mind,
who were as ready to be militant against Princes,
and Peace, as he to command it: Till at last the
Monarch by a packt bribed Clergy having got
possession of a Power like to absolute, disgraced it
with a succession of such Monsters of wickedness,
as the most flattering of their Historians declare
to be unworthy to be named in the Catalogue.
And they had so often two Popes at once, filling
the World with blood, while by the Sword they
tryed *their Cause*, and at last three Popes (and saith
Wernerus in Fasc. Temp. once six at once that were
then, and had been Popes) some Kingdoms being
for

for one, and some for another, that the Christian World could no longer bear the mischievous effect, *France* having one Pope, and *Italy* and *Germany* another, expose the Nations to blood, and the Christian Religion to decay and scorn: Till necessity forced the Emperor of *Germany* and other Princes, first by the Council of *Constance*, and after by that at *Basil*, to overtop, depose and correct the Popes.

§ VII. But when the Councils were ended, though a Decennial Council was decreed, and all means used to prevent relapse, the chief Executive Power in the intervals being in the Monarch (the Pope) and it being the Pope, and not the Councils that gave Preferments, all the Councils Decrees against Absoluteness, and for Decennial Councils proved but empty words. The worldly Bishops clave to the Pope. *Engenius* 4. condemned and Deposed as an Heretick, Simoniack, &c. continued in despite of his deposers, and their succession is from him to this day. The Greeks by necessity were forced a while to countenance a debauched Council at *Florence*, to undo what the other Councils had done, (who are there pronounced Rebellious Church-Parliaments, who would have changed the Universal Monarchy;) But being cheated, they went home, and had so sad entertainment by the Greek Church, as made them repent, and wish they had hearkened to their *Marcus Ephesus*.

§ VIII. Things returning to the old channel of Tyranny and Corruption, and their Clergy not reforming, Reformers got a double advantage, 1. By the sense of the need of Reformation, which the two Church Parliaments, *Constance* and *Basil* (after *Pisa*)

Pisa) had left upon the Peoples minds, with the general murmur at their frustration. 2. The horrid Corruption of the Clergy by gross Ignorance, palpable Errours, Pride, Covetousness, and almost all iniquity, which made even nature loath them: Whereupon the old *Bohemian* complaints were reassumed, and *Tecelinus's* Indulgences provoking *Luther*, he awakened the University of *Wittenburg*, and they the Princes and Learned men of *Germany*.

§ IX. At their first awakening, they coming newly out of darkness, were sensible of little but the gross sort of corruptions, which men of common sense and morality might perceive: And few had studied the case of a Pretended Universal Jurisdiction, being bred up in the Reverence of that Church Unity for which it was pretended: But one Truth let in another till the case became very commonly understood.

Accordingly men fell into three Parties. 1. The worldly Clergy was against Church-Parliaments, unless such as would obey the Pope, and against Reformation, saying, The Pope was fittest to do what was to be done, for Councils and Popular Humours would never know where to stop, but would break down all the Churches strength and glory. 2. *Luther's* Party (after their riper thoughts) were for such a Reformation as consisted in a nullifying of the Papal Church and Separation from it, as no True Church, but the Seat of Antichrist. 3. A moderate sort of Papists were for reforming of many things in the Roman Church, but not for nullifying it. They were for reconciling the two Parties, and for submissive Conformity, but not for Separation. Such were *Julius Pflug*, *Sidonius*, and *Agricola*, who drew up the *Interim*, and also
Erasmus,

Erasmus, Cassander, Ar. Baldwin, Wicelins, &c. And in France the great Chancellor *Michael Hospitalius, Thuinn*, and many of their most excellent Lawyers and Parliament-men, and some Bishops and Divines.

These men being offended at the *Separating* part of the Reformation, were taken with the notion of Unity and Government, but understood not the true state of the Controversie, and were of two minds among themselves. 1. Some had long had an untryed notion by Tradition, that the Church throughout the World was One Body Politick under one Humane Government. 2. Others never thought of that, but having seen a submission of all the Western Churches to the Pope, thought a Separation unlawful.

§ X. But the case of the *Separation*, which they understood not who blamed it, was this.

The Reformers took the Universal Church in all the Earth to have no Head, King, or Sovereign Governour but Christ, none else having the least shew of true capacity or right; and therefore that none had an Universal Legislative, Judicial or Executive Power: And a Church-Sovereignty was a more irrational conceit than a Civil Sovereignty over all the Earth: And an Aristocracy of Bishops more irrational than a Papal Monarchy. Therefore they professed not to separate from Papists as Christians, or from any of their Societies as parts of Christ's Church; but to renounce, deny, and separate from their new *Usurped Church-Species or Form*, as it is feigned to be an *Universal Humane Sovereign with his Subjects*. Had they never corrupted other Doctrine or Worship this Church-Species of Universal Sovereignty, is to be separated from.

2. And

2. And with all, the Reformers found, that though they could have submitted to Patriarchs as a Humane Power set up by Princes, had they Governed according to the Laws of Christ, yet
 1. It being but a Humane Power, 2. And one Prince having no right to set up a Patriarch over another Princes Subjects, 3. And the Roman Patriarch claiming also the Universal Sovereignty, or part of it in Councils; 4. And having corrupted Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, they took it to be their duty to renounce also the Pope's Patriarchal Government; and for all Christians to obey Christ's Universal Laws alone, and the Local Laws *circa sacra* left to man's Legislation, of the particular Princes and States where they live. And not to place Universal Unity or Concord in any Usurping Humane Sovereign, or their Laws, or mutable circumstances: And, had those excellent moderate Papists before-named, well studied this point of Universal Sovereignty, it's like they had forsaken *Rome*.

§ XI. When the Pope thought to satisfy the World, and confound the Reformation by the Council of *Trent*, the Cardinal of *Lorain*, and the French consented not to much that they there did; but stuck to the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, lest they should lose the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church: So that it was long e're that Nation seemed to own the Council of *Trent*, and never did it heartily and universally; but continued at some further distance from the Absoluteness of the Pope than *Italy* or *Spain*. And to this day they continue to maintain, 1. That the Pope hath no Power over the King in Temporals: 2. That he hath no Power to Depose Kings: 3. That General

ral Councils are so far above him as to reform him and his disorders 4. That he is not Infallible alone, but in conjunction with the Church or Councils. And though some have spoken and written against the first and second, *Barclay* and many others have confuted them, and the Parliaments have burnt their Books. And this is the Moderate Popery of *France*.

Well may I call them Papists still ; for, 1. They renounce not a Humane Universal Church Sovereignty. 2. They allow the Pope to call Councils, and Preside, and to be the *principium Unitatis*, and Patriarch of the West. 3. They know that when no Church-Parliaments are in being, the Universal Executive Power must be continued, or the Universal Policy be dissolved : Therefore they allow the Pope a Right of Universal Government according to the Canons, but not Arbitrary ; and therefore not above Councils : So that if those that are for the King Ruling by Law, and making Laws only in and by Parliaments, be yet for Monarchy then *Council. Constan. Basil*, and the French are yet for Popery.

As to our Reformation it is so fully recorded by many and newly by that excellent and moderate Historian Dr. *Burnet*, that for the time he writes I shall only transcribe a few Notes out of his Abridgment.

Page 87. The Oaths which the Bishops swore to the Pope and the King were found so inconsistent, as it appeared both could not be kept ; which caused the Popes to be dismissd.

Page 113. An Act was made for Election and Consecration of Bishops ; in short, The King to name one, and the Dean and Chapter in twelve days

days to return an Election of the person named by the King——

Page 138. *Cranmer, Tonstall, Clark and Goodrik*, Bishops being called to give their Opinion of the Emperors Power to call Councils said, That though ancient Councils were called by the *Roman Emperors*, yet that was done by reason of the extent of their Monarchy that was now ceased : But since other Princes had an entire Monarchy within their Dominions : Yet if one or more of those Princes should agree to call a Council to a good intent, and desire the concurrence of the rest, they were bound by the rule of CHARITY to agree to it.

Page 139. *Cranmer* said——that this Authority of General Councils flowed not from the Number of Bishops, but from the Matter of their decisions ; which were received with an Universal Consent ; for there were many more Bishops at *Arimini* — than at *Nice* or *Constantinople*, &c. Christ had named no Head of the whole Church, as God had named no Head of the World ——

In Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign 1559. the Divines appointed to dispute against the Papist Bishops in their second paper maintain, *That every Church had power to reform it self* : This they founded on the Epistles of *Paul* to the particular Churches, and *St. John* to the Angels of the Seven Churches : In the first three Ages there were no General Councils, but every Bishop in his Diocess, or such few Bishops as could assemble together, condemned Heresies, determined Matters that were contested ; so did also the Orthodox after *Arrianisme* had so overspread the World that even the See of *Rome* was defiled with it.

Page 358. A Bill that came to nothing was for empowering thirty two Persons to revise the Ecclesiastical Laws: But as this last was then let fall, so to the great prejudice of this Church, it hath slept ever since.

For before this p. 129, 130. l. 2. In King *Edward's* Reign *Bucer's* Opinion was asked about the review of the Common Prayer Book: He wished there might not be only a denunciation against scandalous Persons that came to the Sacrament, but a Discipline to exclude them: That the Habits might be laid aside, &c. — At the same time he understood that the King expected a New Years Gift from him, of a Book written particularly for his own use: So he made a Book for him concerning the Kingdom of Christ: He prest much the setting up a strict Discipline, the Sanctification of the Lords day, the appointing many days of Fasting, and that Pluralities and Non-residence might be effectually condemned; that Children might be Catechized, that the reverence due to Churches might be preserved, that the Pastoral Function might be restored to what it ought to be, that Bishops might throw off Secular Affairs, and take care of their Diocesses, and Govern them by the advice of their Presbyters; that there might be Rural Bishops over twenty or thirty Parishes, and that Provincial Councils might meet twice a year; that Church Lands be restored, and a fourth part assigned to the poor; — that care be taken for Education of Youth and for repressing Luxury, that the Law be reformed, and no Office sold but given to the most deserving, that none be put in Prison upon slight offences — The young King

King was much pleased with these advices : And upon that began himself to form a Scheme for amending many things, &c. — It appears by it that he intended to set up a Church Discipline, and settle a Method for breeding Youth —

Page 361, 362, li. 4. To return to Queen Elizabeth, the Changes are recited, and he addeth, *[The liberty given to explain in what sense the Oath of Supremacy was taken, gave a great evidence of the Moderation of the Queens Government ; that she would not lay snares for her people, which is always a sign of a Wicked and Tyrannical Prince. But the Queen reckoned that if such comprehensive Methods could be found out as would once bring her people under any Union, though perhaps there might remain a great diversity of Opinion, that would wear off with the present Age, and in the next Generation all would be of one mind.]*

Page 363. The Empowering Lay men to deprive Church-men, or Excommunicate, could not be easily excused; but was as justifiable as the Commissions to Lay-Chancellors for those things were. There are 9400 Benefices in England, but of all these the Number of those (viz. Papists) who chose to resign rather than take the Oath was very inconsiderable. Fourteen Bishops, Six Abbots, Twelve Deans, Twelve Archdeacons, Fifteen Heads of Colledges, Fifty Prebendaries, and Eighty Rectors was the whole number of those that were turned out : But it was believed that the greatest part complied against their Consciences, and would have been ready for another turn, if the Queen had died while that Race of Incumbents lived, and the next Successor had been of another Religion.

Read what he saith of Mr. Parker's great unwillingness to be A. Bishop, and the threat-
C
ning

ning else to Imprison him. p. 363, 364, &c.

I conclude with that honest Note, p. 369.
 [*There was one thing yet wanting to compleat the Reformation of this Church, which was the restoring a Primitive Discipline against scandalous Persons, the stablishing the Government of the Church in Ecclesiastical hands, and taking it out of Lay hands who have so long profaned it — So that the dreadfulest of all Censures is now become most scorned and despised. See the rest.*

The Papists in Queen Elizabeth's days sometime strove by Treasons the recovery of their Power; and secretly strove by Policy to divide the Protestants, and to root out those that were most against them. The Ministers unhappily fell into these Parties. 1. Some were for the Grandeur of the Bishops, and for strict observance of Liturgy and Ceremonies, and against Parochial Discipline; and these prevailed with the Queen. 2. Some were against Diocesan Bishops and Ceremonies, and some things in the Liturgy, and were for Parish Discipline: And these were called Nonconformists and Puritans. 3. *Melancthon* and *Bucer* had prevailed with some others, who were indifferent as to Bishops, and most of the Ceremonies and Forms, but Zealous for Parish Discipline and a godly Life, and for using things indifferent only indifferently, to Edification, and not to the hinderance of the Ministry of refusers. And *Bucer's Scripta Anglicana* written for K. Edward, which urged this Parish Discipline with great Zeal and Judgment, prevailed with a great part of the Queens Council, and of the Protestant Nobility and Gentry; but most of the Clergy were of the two first mentioned Opinions, called Extrems by others.

§ 4. All the Parliaments that were called in Queen *Elizabeth's* time were still suspicious that Popery would keep too much strength by the peoples Ignorance and Impiety, for want of good Preaching and godly Living in the Ministry : And therefore were usually complaining of the Bishops (especially *Whitgift*) for silencing so many Nonconforming Preachers, and keeping up so many Pluralists, and so many meer Readers : And they were oft attempting a Reformation of this, and to have restored the Nonconformists, and united the godly Protestants : But by the Bishops Counsel the Queen still restrained them, and charged them not to meddle with Ecclesiastical Matters, as belonging to her ; In Sir *Simond Deyes* Journals you may see the many attempts and her constant prohibition and restraint : And Parliaments were loth to offend her, or make any breach, remembering how great a deliverance they had by her from Queen *Mary's* Persecutions. Though they grudged at the Imprisonment of Mr. *Strickland* and others that had spoke earnestly for Reformation, of Bishops Affairs, and the Ministry, yet they bore it patiently because of what they did enjoy. One of their strongest attempts you may read in their Petition of Sixteen Articles in Sir *Sim. Deyes*, An. 1584, and 1585. page 357. which is well worth the reading : But it was not endured.

But she long endured the Popish Bishops in their Seats, though in Parliament the A Bishop of *York*, the Bishop of *London*, the Bishops of *Worcester*, *Landaff*, *Coventree*, *Oxford*, *Chester*, the Abbot of *Westminster* were against the Bill for the Supremacy and abolishing Popery. See Sir *S. Deyes*

p. 28. and p. 23. also the Bishops of *Winchester, Carlile, Exceter.* Which patience of hers mentioned put Sir S. D. the Historian on the recital of so large a Catalogue of Records for the Kings Power against the Pope and Usurping Bishops as is worth the reading, page 24.

§ 5. Also for many years the Papists came to our Temples, till the Pope forbade them: But the Parliament men much differed about this: Some would have all men forced to the Sacrament: Others would have them forced to hear some allowed Teachers, but not to be compelled to the Sacrament, because it is the investing of men in the Pardon of sin and right to Salvation, which no unwilling Person is capable of. Of this see in the foresaid Author, p. 177. the Excellent Speech of Mr. *Aglionke*, and of others.

I mention this because the late Reconcilers have made the mixture of Papists and Protestants in Communion the first ten years of the Queen to be the desirable state to which they would have had us reduced. Of which more anon.

But the Queen here also restrained them, and would have all left to her and the Bishops.

Mr. *Yelverton* told them how perillous a President it might prove for worser times for the Parliament to be so restrained; *Where* (saith he) *there was such fulness of Power, as even the right of the Crown was to be determined, and by warrant whereof we had foreolved, that to say the Parliament had no Power to determine of the Crown was High Treason.* *Ibid.* page 176.

§ 6. The Invasion 1588, and many Treasons, and the Popes Excommunications, increased the Parliaments Zeal against Popery, and the Clergies

gies also. And when the Case of the Queen of Scots was referred to the Council of the Parliament, they earnestly urged the Queen by many Reasons, to execute the Sentence of Death which was past upon her; seeing while the Papists hoped for her Reign, neither the Life of the Queen nor the Kingdom could be safe. See Sir S. D' Ewes, page 400, &c.

These were their apprehensions then of Popery.

§ 7. In K. James's time the horrid Powder Plot to have blown up King and Parliament, and the Murder of Two Kings in France successively, H. 3. and H. 4. and other Inhumanities, increased this Kingdoms Zeal against Popery. As the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were made for their discovery, so multitudes of Learned Men were employed in confuting their pretended Sovereignty and manifold Errors. And the common Preachers had ordinarily in their Sermons *One Use*, as they called it, *for the Confutation of the Papists*. Besides that the *Homilies* and *Jewels* writings against them were to be in every Church. And as many of the Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's first time were such as had been Exiles and Suffered by the Papists, so many both in her days and K. James's, were Learned and Godly Men, who remembred former times, and were greatly desirous of the Extirpation of Popery, and of the increase of able Preachers, and of the Concord of Protestants to that End. And the Books of Martyrs written by John Fox being common in all parts of the Land, increased the peoples hatred of Religious cruelty. But some few Bishops (speci-ally A. Bishop Whitgift and Bancroft) exceeded

the rest in their prosecution of the Nonconformists; And though before by connivance they had enjoyed more quietness, yet when once the Canon was made and Executed for Subscribing that [*there is nothing contrary to the Word of God in the Liturgy, &c.*] and the Excommunicating Canons, five, six, seven, &c. the reconciliation of the Protestants seemed hopeless.

Yet even the hottest prosecuting Bishops were firm Adversaries to Popery; yea *Whitgift* thought Arminianism came so near it, as made him consent to the ill-framed *Lambeth Articles*. And that unhappy Controversie called Arminian (which I have largely proved to be over-aggravated on both sides for want of a distinct way of Examination, in my *Cath. Theol.*) increased the Division much. The Jesuits being most hated by the Protestants, the Arminians were taken to incline to Popery, though the Dominicans who had been on the contrary side, had been the Bloody Masters of the Inquisition. And when our English Arminians were accused of approaching Popery, it inclined some of them to think more favourably of a Reconciliation with those whom they were likened to. And the Papists never ceased their diligence, secret or open, for the restoration of their Forreign Jurisdiction and their Errors.

§ XII. The Councils at the *Laterane*, *Lyons*, and others having so set up the Pope above Kings, as that those whom he Excommunicates may be deposed, and are then no Kings: And their Most Learned Doctors writing this, the Pope came to lay much of his strength upon King-killing; and it hath proved too successful: Had it been only
against

against Rebellion, Kings had their defence: But what can one do against a Desperado, who is promised Preferment if he escape, and taught, if he so die for the service of the Church, to look for as much greater a Reward than Martyrs, as his service is more voluntary, and of more publick benefit than theirs? When *Henry* the Third was so murdered in *France*, *Henry* the Fourth turned Papist, it's like much for fear. And when the first Knife had but struck out his Teeth, the next dispatcht him. King *James* here was not a fearless man: He had known of the many Treasons which Queen *Elizabeth* escaped. The Powder-Plot thundred to him, though it took not fire. King *Henry's* Stabs did yet speak louder. He was told, *This shall be your End; think not to escape; Instruments will be found who prefer the Church before their Lives, if you repent not.* What a strait now is a King in, whose Life is thus at the mercy of a thousand deluded desperate Slaves of the Pope! That which kindleth revenging anger in a Kingdom or Senate, may rationally cause fear in a single man: For it is easier to kill a King, than a Kingdom or a multitude.

§ XIII. The unhappy Differences about the five Articles in *Belgio* (in which I am past doubt both Parties there were much to be blamed) involved the Learned *Hugo Grotius* in sufferings: The Contra-Remonstrants were too violent, and trusted to the Sword of the Prince of *Orange*; and *Grotius* being condemned to Imprisonment, and by his Wife got out in a Trunk, on pretence of carrying away his Books, becoming the Queen of *Swedens* Resident Ambassador in *France*, no doubt exasperated, and falling into intimate acquaintance with

the French Jesuits, especially *Petavius*, grew to that approbation of the Moderate French Popery, which I have here after proved, and to that desire of reducing the Protestants to them, which not only *Valesius Orat. in Obi. Petavii*, but his own Writings fully testifie. And his design was to bring *Rome* as the Mistress Church, to Rule, not arbitrarily, but by the Canons of Councils, securing the Right of Kings and Bishops, and casting aside the Schoolmens subtil vain Disputes, and reforming the bad lives of the Clergy, and some small mutable things; and in this to draw in the Church of *France*, and *England* to agree, and the Queen of *Sweden*, and if possible the *Lutherans*, and to crush the *Calvinists* as unreconcilable: And he tells us how many in *England* favoured what he did, though those whom he miscalleth *Brownists* were against it.

§ IV. The Church of *England* and the Parliament being before discontented at the Marriage-Articles as to Toleration, and at the Popes Agents and Nuntio's here in *London*, were much more offended at the changes suddenly made by Bishop *Laud*. The blotting out the name of the Pope and Antichrist, and the Zeal for Altars and Bowings, and the report of a Treaty for Union with *Rome*, Printed by some with the particulars, and their conceit that Arminianism lookt towards Popery, and the casting out many Conformable Ministers, and many such things, especially when they thought the Liberty of their Persons, and their Properties had been Invaded, and that A. Bishop *Laud*, and the new Clergy Men, (*Sibthorp, Mainwaring, Heylin*, &c.) were the Cause of all; I say, These things raising in men a dread of Popery

our

our greater distances were here begun: And though in A. Bishop *Abbot's* days the Church of *England* was against the Syncretism, and few went with Bishop *Laud* at first, he afterwards got many to adhere to him. He that would see all the Case in an unsuspected Author, let him read Dr. *Heylins* Life of A. B. *Laud*, where he shall find much of the proceedings, and the Articles and Reasons of the Treaty with the Papists. And if he add *Laud's* Tryal, and *Rushworth's* Collections, he may see more. *Heylin* tells us that the Design was but to bring the Papists in to us, by removing that which kept them out: They that feared a Toleration of Papists did much more fear a *Comprehension* or Coalition, though their *Conversion* they desired: For they knew that they must still be Members of the false Universal Papal Kingdom, and that we must in the greatest points come to them, who without changing their Religion could not come to us: And if we could hardly now keep out the Pope, what should we do when he had got so much more advantage of us? Besides all other Changes we must change our very *Church-species*, or else we should not be of the same Church, though we sate in the same Seats: For a *Church which is but a subject part of a Sovereign greater Church*, is no more of the same *species* with one that is subject to no other (but Christ) than our *Cities are of the same species with a Kingdom*.

§ XVI. These distances between the old Church-men and the Laudians having increased to that which they came to in 1641. suddenly on Octob. 23. the Irish Rebellion Murdering two hundred thousand, and *Fame* threatening their coming into *England*, cast the Nation into so great

great fear of the Papists, and next of Bishop *Land's* new Clergy who were supposed to be for a Coalition, as was the Cause (where-ever I came) of Mens conceit of the necessity of defensive Arms; and this was increased by two or three Opinions which many were then guilty of, who had not Learning enough to know which side was right according to the Law.

One of their Opinions was, *That the Law of Nature is the Law of God.* Another was that no men have Authority to abrogate it. Another was that the Law of Nature inclineth men to Love their Lives, and to private Self-defence. Another was that every Kingdom or Nation hath by the Law of God in Nature, a right of publick Self-defence against professed Enemies and apparent danger of its destruction. And another was, that *They whose profest Religion obligeth them on pain of Damnation to do their best to exterminate or destroy the Body of the Kingdom (are to be taken for its profest Enemies, if they renounce not that obligation: Especially if they or their Confederates Murder two hundred thousand Fellow-Subjects, and apparently strive for power over the rest.* These Opinions being then received, and by many ill-applied, things then ran to what we saw.

§ XVII. When the old Churchmen and Parliament on one side, (and we know who on the other side) began the War, necessity caused them to call in the Scots as Auxiliaries, who brought in the Covenant and attempted Illegally the Change of the Church Government; and all after falling into the hands of *Cromwell* and his Army, the King destroyed, the Parliament pulled down, and other unthought of Changes which we saw, Discord and War grew odious to the Nation.

And

And we longed to be reconciled to those that we had differed from especially in matters of Religion.

Among others more considerable, I attempted in *Worcestershire* a Reconciliation with them. I tryed first with my Neighbours: The Gentry that I spake with of the Royal Party, professed willingness, and that they desired but the Security of the Essentials of Episcopacy. Dr. *Good* and Dr. *Warmstrie* with others of them Subscribed their approbation to our Agreement: When I tryed with others distant, Bishop *Usher* easily consented, Bishop *Brownrig* on somewhat harder terms, but such as would have healed us; Dr. *Hammond* on harder yet, but yet such as we could have born save that he left all to the uncertain determination of a Convocation. But shortly Dr. *Warmstrie* withdrew his Consent, and as the reason of it sent me a Writing against our Agreement, saying, It was a confederacy with Schism, and labouring to prove that they were no Ministers or Churches which had not Episcopal Ordination, and much more to that effect. I wrote a full answer to it, which satisfied all that I shewed it to, but did not publish it. The writing answered was Dr. *Peter Guning's*, now Bishop of *Eli*. Presently I found this opinion, That *they were no true Ministers or Churches that had not an uninterrupted Succession of Diocesane Ordination from the Apostles*, but that *they were true Ministers and Churches that had Roman Ordination*, became the stop to our desired Agreement, and I saw that it proclaimed an utter renunciation of the Reformed Churches which have no such Succession, and yet a Coalition with the *Roman Clergy*, though the

the Bishops of *Rome* have had the most notorious intercessions. And having read *Grotius* his *Discussio Apologetici Rivetiani* in which he more plainly pleads for Canonical Popery, than he had done in his *Votum*, or *Consultatio*, &c. I thought I was bound in Conscience to give notice to the Royalists of the Grotian Party and Design, and after printed a small Collection out of *Grotius* his own words: These Dr. *Pierce* wrote against, and others were offended at. But in the Second Part of my Key for Catholicks, I shewed the utter impossibility of this Conceit of Sovereign Government by General Councils.

§. XVIII. When God was pleased by the restoration of the King to raise Mens hopes of Protestant Agreement, I need not repeat what was done towards it; among many worthier Persons by my Self, the Earl of *Manchester* and the Earl of *Oxery* first making from us the motion to His Majesty, who readily consented, and granted us the healing Terms exprest in His gracious Declaration of Ecclesiastical Affairs 1661; for which the *London* Ministers subscribed a Thanksgiving, and the House of Commons gave him their Publick Thanks, as making for the Publick Concord. But when the King under the Broad Seal granted a Commission to many on both Sides, to treat and agree of such Alterations of the Liturgy as were necessary to tender Consciences, and the Bishops and their Drs. yielded not to the least, but to the last maintained that none were necessary for them; I saw in the *Manner* and the *Issue* with whom it was that we had to do, and consequently what *England* must expect. I easily perceived that much more would be imposed. For I saw what some intended,

intended, and I could conjecture what must be the Means : But others went further than they. If I my self had been of the opinion that a Syncretism or Coalition with the Church of *France* on *Grotius's* terms had been the way of Church Concord most pleasing to God, and that all were intolerable Schismaticks that united not on these terms, as Members of one Universal Church, under one humane Sovereignty. It's like I should have done my best to accomplish these things following, at least, if I were also of the temper of those of that Mind which I have known.

I. I should have laboured to render all those as odious and contemptible as I could, that had been against the Coalition.

II. It's like I should have done what I could to Silence all those Ministers that were likest to hinder my Design.

III. It's like I should have desired if less would not do this, that more might be imposed on them, that it might be effectually done.

IV. It's like I should have done all that I could to Banish them far enough from the Ears and Presence and Acquaintance of Rulers, that we might represent them at our pleasure, and they might not answer for themselves.

V. If all this would not do, were I sufficiently hardened, It's like I should endeavour to break all those that will not bend, and to ruine them utterly, and lay them in Jailes with Rogues, and make men believe that they are intollerable Persons deserving worse, and that all this is Mercy to them.

VI. It's like that were I of that mind and temper, I should make it my chief design to make

a tender Conscience a Scorn, and to drive it out of Esteem and Power, and then there would be little *in the rest* to hinder my desires; I might expect that they would all take my Pills whom I could first get to swallow as big a thing.

VII. I would make the great noise about Episcopacy, Liturgy and Conformity, and not say a word till all were ready of a Coalition with the French Papists or Roman Church.

VIII. I would (as Dr. *Heylin*) call this a Drawing in the Papists to us, when we had opened the Door wide enough for their Universal Sovereignty, and I would not call it a going over to them.

IX. It's like I should learn of *Grotius*, to call none *Papists* but only those that count all good and lawful that the Popes do, or as Dr. *Saywell*, disown none but the *Jesuited Party*, and then I would detest and rant against Papists as hotly as any of them all.

X. I would not put any Oath or Profession of *Popery*, or of an Universal foreign Jurisdiction on any of the Lay Communicants, nor on the Inferior Clergy till they were ripe for it: It's gently said of Dr. *Saywell*, *What Bishop puts you to own the Power of General Councils before he will give you the Sacrament?* If the Bishops will but own and be subject to a foreign Jurisdiction, and the Clergy only to the Bishops at first, and the Laity to that Clergy and Bishop; the Chain is strong enough at present, we need no more.

XI. I will Prognosticate no further conditionally of my self, but whoever is engaged in such work, above all cannot spare the Engine of *Historical Untruths*. Against those that may not be heard

heard speak for themselves, nor be acquainted with them that hear the report, this must do the greatest part of the work; it cannot be probably done without it: Perjury is a thing that I will not meddle with.

XII. They must make the Differences of Protestants as odious as they can, and make men believe that they are running mad for want of Catholick Government and Unity, and as a late Book called *An Address, &c.* tell them that lately there were *an Hundred and forty several Sects*, (and if it be denied, it is but proving so many Complexions.)

XIII. Above all, they must say nothing for the *Pope himself*, but only for *General Councils*, advancing their Honour by making odious all that they Condemned, and by the Reverence that Protestants have exprest to the best as means of Concord: And they must be sure to confound *Concord and Government, Communion and Subjection.*

XIV. And they must be sure to keep the Ministry; partly in hope of Preferment, and partly in servile Dependance, and specially to *Corrupt the Universities*, that part may be Ignorant and Vicious, and part ambitious Militants; And when once all these have got into Church Livings, let the Dislikers get them out if they can.

XV. Some have ever found it of great use to Altering-designs, to represent all that are against it as Rebellious, and make Rulers believe that they are their Enemies. And when our King here hath done so much by the Act of Oblivion, and advancing the late Duke of *Albemarle*, and acknowledging the Service of him and his Army, and many others who formerly fought against him,

him, I cannot but suspect some Altering design in them that would still rub the old Sores, and fetch thence Materials for all their Purposes. (If I may mix *ridiculous* things with *terrible*;) that as the Drunken Man easing his Bladder by a running Conduit, stood half the day there in a mingent posture, complaining to Passengers that his Water would not stop, because he still heard the Conduit run; so if they can but make the Nation Drunk or Melancholick, the noise of nothing but *War*, and *Rebellion*, and *Blood*, will make them think that their Blood is still running.

XVI. And beyond Sea, the Papists have found it the greatest Expedient to their Successes, to keep Great Men from Study, and Learning, yea, and from Conscience and Sobriety, and train them up with Sport, and Wine and Women, and Debauchery, and ranting Jollity, and scorns at Conscience and Preciseness, that they may not discern their own interest, nor have understanding enough to see the Snare, but may tamely put their foot in the Stocks & under pretence of Universal Concord and Government, make themselves the Subjects of a foreign Usurpation. And if the Pope may but govern till the next General Council, it will be like a Lease of many Hundred Years, as good as a Fee-simple; And may he but Rule all as Patriarch and *Principium Unitatis* by the Canons already made, it will be as good as the Guardianship of Infants, that will never call the Guardian to Account.

§. XIX. I must say after all this, that I love the French Church much better than the Italian, and if we must all be Papists, had rather we were French Papists, of the two. And yet that I more
fear

fear the French Papists than the Italians. For the Italian Party are at so visible a distance, that they can design no way for their advantage but a Toleration (unless they could get the Government) And their Toleration would a while but make the Nation better know them, and more dislike them : But the French Party cry down Toleration, and trust wholly to a Coalition and to force : They hope to do their work before its known what they are doing : They will cry down Popery, meaning only the Pope's absolute Power above Councils : It is but abating the Latine Service, Transubstantiation, Priests Marriage, granting the Cup to the Laity, and two or three more such things, and crying up nothing but the *Name of the Church of England* (though changed by Subjection to a Forreign Jurisdiction) and then crying up *Obedience and Conformity to it*, and crying down Schism as an intolerable thing, and the Papists shall seem to turn to us, and not we to them, and then no Dissenter shall be suffered. Mr. *Thorndikes* Book of forbearance of *Penalties*, tells us of no other hope of sufferance, but on supposition that we all agree in subjection to the thing called, *The Universal Political Church*. And a Learned Tribe by Interest and Opinion engaged in the Cause may be ready by confident triumphant Writings and Disputes to make good all this, and scorn and tread down Gainfayers as Schismaticks. And the Coalition will take in the parts and labours of those that now are called Papists, who are trained up in Militant Arts.

XX. But as long as God and the King are against them, we need not much fear the Success of their Endeavours : Such a Care hath the King had to secure the Land against all suspicion of Popery.

pery in himself, that a severe penalty is to be inflicted on any that shall so defame him: Yea he hath passed Acts for the Clergy, Corporations, Vestries, the Militia, Nonconformists, in which they are all obliged by Promise or *Oath* never to *Endeavour any Alteration of the Government of Church and State*: And again I say, what sober Man can be so sottish as to think that to subject the King, Clergy, and whole Kingdom to the Forreign Jurisdiction of a pretended Universal Sovereignty (Monarchical, Aristocratical or Mixt) is no alteration of the Government of the Church, yea of the Church-specifying Form.

XXI. This is a great secondary reason why we cannot be for such a change because we cannot Consent that Church, Vestries, Corporations, Militia, &c. should be all perfidious or perjured: Yea all the Land that have taken the Oath of Supremacy against all Forreign Jurisdiction. We accuse not others but excuse our selves: Yea what Crime is it against King and Kingdom, to make them the Subjects of a Forreign Power, I leave to other men to enquire.

XXII. God seemeth purposely to have confounded them in their Design, by leaving them no *Materials* for their Fabrick. I can imagine no pretences of possibility but in some of these following ways. 1. That it is the *Colledge of Bishops* diffused over the Earth that must exercise Legislation and Judgment by Consent, or by Majority of Votes: And I shall never fear the prevalency of this Opinion, till an Epidemical Madness turneth us into a *Bedlam*.

2. That it must be a true General Council that must Govern us: And this is no more to be expected

pected than that all the World fall under one Monarch, or that all Christians save one Kingdom Apostatize ; which God prevent.

3. That Patriarchs with such Metropolitans as they will call, be taken for the Governing Representatives of all the Bishops and Churches on Earth. But there is no possibility left us of this way: For it must be either by the five old Patriarchs or by new ones. 1. If the old ones, Gods Judgments have made that way unpracticable. 1. The Cities of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* are destroyed, where two of the Patriarchs should be Bishops. 2. The Turk is Lord of four of the old Patriarchal Seats ; and none can be chosen, rule, or come to Councils without his Consent. And he can get almost whom he will Chosen, and so the Turk should be our Chief Church Governour. And the Places are bought with Money, and the Possessors answerable. *Ludolphus* tells us that the Patriarch of *Alexandria* is some unlearned ignorant Person that scarce knoweth Letters, and that Men are made Clergy-men there against their wills, all Men shunning the Office because of the Sufferings from the Turk which they must undergo. They have no just Qualification, Election or Power : There are three nominal Patriarchs of *Antioch* chosen by three several Parties, besides the Popes. They are utterly uncertain which of them is right, or rather certain that none of them are or can be such. All the four Nominal Patriarchs are against the *Romans*, and several against each other : And many of the chief Christian Churches own none of them as their Governours, and none own them all as such.

And must our Kings and Kingdoms be Subjects

of ignorant Subjects of the Turk, because once Men were advanced to high Titles over Towns now destroyed, in one Christian Empire now dissolved or turned Mahometans.

4. There is therefore but one way left, which is for the Pope and his Privy Council of Cardinals to be the standing Governour, by Judgment and Execution, and to call when Princes force him to it, such European Councils as he can, and (as he doth) to make four Nominal Patriarchs (of *Const. Alex. Antioch* and *Jerusalem*) as Men make Kings, Queens, and Bishops on a Chess-board, and to call these General Councils, as he did that at *Trent*, and to keep the people ignorant enough to believe it.

As for the making of a sort of new Patriarchs there must go so much to agree who they shall be among all Christian Princes and Nations, and then to prove that they are the true Representers of all others, and that the Representers or represented have any Universal Legislative Power, that I am in no Expectations of any such Sovereignty. I have proved against Mr. *Hooker* that the Body of the people as *such* are not the Givers of the Power of their Governours, and therefore cannot give power to an Universal Supream.

XXIII. When I had seen all Mr. *Thorndike's* Books, and Dr. *Heylins*, and some other such, and A. Bishop *Bramhall's* Book against me, with a long and vehement reprovng Preface, I purposed to have again detected the design, and have answered that Book. But my Bookseller *Nevill Simons* told me that Mr. *Roger Lestrange* then Overseer of the Press, came to him and vehemently protested that he would ruine him if he printed
my

my Answer to it : And when it might not be Printed I forbore to Write it.

Since then among others Mr. *Dodwell* hath appeared with most Voluminous confidence, whom I have answered ; who I doubt not will want neither Ink, Paper, Words or Face for a reply.

My Conference with Bishop *Gunning* I thought it against the Rules of Converse to publish. But his Chaplain Dr. *Saywell*, Master of a Colledge in *Cambridge*, whom I take for his Mouth, being himself present, hath published what he would have the World to believe of our Discourse, in a Book against me, for Universal Jurisdiction : And therefore he hath put some necessity on me to publish the Truth, which I am confident will not be to the Readers loss of time, who will peruse it. When I had sent him my Book of *Concord*, he sent me Dr. *Saywell's* first, by Dr. *Crowther*, of which I wrote to him my sence. On this he desired me to come speak with him, which having done three several days, I thought it meet at Night to Recollect our Discourse and send him the Sum of all in Letters, that neither he might forget it, or any Man misrepresent it. These four Letters I have therefore here annexed, and with them an answer to Dr. *Saywell's* Reasons for a Forreign Jurisdiction.

XXIV. I am so far from charging the Church of *England* with the guilt of this Doctrine or Design, that I prove that the Church of *England* is utterly against it. But then by that Church I do not mean any Men that can get height and confidence enough to call themselves the Church of *England* ; but those that adhere to the Articles of Religion, the Doctrine, Worship and Government by Law Established.

XXV. And I am so far from uncharitable Censures of the Men whom I thus confute, that I profess that I believe Mr. *Thorndike*, Bishop *Guning*, Mr. *Dodwell*, &c. to be Men that do what they do in an Erroneous Zeal for Unity and Government, and are Men of great Labour, Learning, and Temperance, and Religious in their way: And I have the same Charity and Honour for many French Papists, yea for such Papal Flatterers as *Baronius* who joyned with *Philip Neri* in his first Oratorian Exercises and Conventicles: Yea I cannot think that they that burn and torment Men for Religion, could live in quietness, if they did not confidently think that it is an acceptable Service to God. And I fear not still to profess that were it in my power, I would have no hurt done to any Papist which is not necessary to our own defence.

But I must say that I much more honour such as *Gerson*, *Ferus*, *Espenceaus*, *Monlucius*, *Erasmus*, *Vives*, *Cassander*, *Hospitalius*, *Thuanus*, &c. who among Papists drew nearer the Reformers, than such among us as having better Company and Helps draw fromward them, and nearer to the Deformers.

XVI. And as to you, Reverend Brethren Conformists, who are true to the True Church of *England*; I humbly crave of you but three things. I. That you will by hard study and Ministerial diligence and holiness of life, keep up to your power the common Interest of Christianity, of Faith and serious Piety and Charity. II. That you will heartily promote the Concord of all godly Protestants, and therein follow such measures as Christ himself hath given us, and as you would have others

others use towards you. III. That you will openly and faithfully disown the dangerous Errour of Universal Legislative and Judicial Sovereignty, and bringing the King, and Church, and Kingdom under any Forreign Jurisdiction, Monarchical, Aristocratical or Mixt; and never stigmatize the Church of *England* and your sacred Order with the odious brand of *Perfidiousness*, after so many Imposed and Received Subscriptions, Professions and Oaths, against all *Endeavours to alter the Government of Church or State.*

XVII. And as to the Nations fears of future Popish Sovereignty, for my part I meddle no further than 1. To do the work of my own Office and Day, 2. And to pray hard for the Nations Preservation, 3. And to trust God, and hope that he will perfect his wonders in such a deliverance, as shall confirm our belief of his special care and providence for his Church.

But I must tell you that such Reasons as Bishop *Gunings* Chaplains, should not be thought strong enough to make you so secure, as to abate the fervour of your prayers. His words are these (more congruous far to him than to you and me) page 282, 283. ["*The only means that is left to preserve our Nation from destruction, and to secure us from the danger of Popery, is to suppress all Conventicles, &c. — Being by this method provided against having our People seduced by the Papists, which as yet they are in great danger of — the next thing is to consider how to prevent violence, that those be not murdered and undone that cannot be persuaded to submit. Now to secure this, His Majesties gracious promises to confirm any Bills that were thought necessary to preserve the Established Religion,*"

" gion, that did not intrench on the Succession of the
 " Crown, do make the way very easie; if our People
 " were united among themselves, and in the Religion
 " of the Church of England. For matters may be so
 " ordered, that all Officers Ecclesiastical, Civil and
 " Military, and all that are employed in Power and
 " Authority, of any kind, be persons both of known
 " Loyalty to the Crown, and yet faithful Sons of the
 " Church, and firm to the Established Religion: And
 " the Laws that they act by may be so explained, in
 " favour of those that Conform to the Publick Worship,
 " and the discouragement of all Dissenters, that we must
 " reasonably be secure from any violence that the Pa-
 " pists can offer to force our submission: For when All
 " our Bishops and Clergy are under strict Obligations
 " and Oaths, and the People are guided by them; and
 " all Officers, Civil and Military, are firm to the same
 " Interest, and under severe penalties, if they act any
 " thing to the contrary: Then what probable danger
 " can there be of any violence or disturbance, to force
 " us out of our Religion, when all things are thus se-
 " cured, and the Power of External Execution is ge-
 " nerally in the hands of men of our own Perswasion.
 " Nay moreover, the Prince himself will by his Coro-
 " nation Oath be obliged to maintain the Laws and
 " Liberties of the Kingdom so Established.]

I am not of a Calling fit to debate the Reasons
 of these Reverend Fathers; some will read them
 with a *Plaudite*; some with a *Ridete*; some with
 a *Cavete*, and I with an *Orate*: And he that will
 abate the fervour of his prayers by such securing
 words, is one whose Prayers *England* is not much
 beholden to. The words with all their designs
 are edifying, as Diagnostick and Prognostick. I
 only say, [Seeing we receive a Kingdom which cannot
 be

be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear ; for our God is a consuming fire, Heb. 12. 28, 29.]

March 28. 1682.

Chap. I. *The Protestant Church of England is against all Humane Universal Sovereignty, Monarchical or Aristocratical ; and so against all Forreign Church Jurisdiction.*

I Prove this, I. From the Oath of Supremacy, which saith thus :

“ I do utterly testifie and declare in my Conscience, That the King’s Highness is the only Supream Governour of this Realm, and of all other His Highness Dominions and Countreys, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes as Temporal. And that No Forreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate, hath, or ought to have ANY JURISDICTION, Power, Superiority, Preheminence or Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual within this Realm. And therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all Forreign Jurisdiction, Priviledges, Preheminence and Authorities granted or belonging to the Kings Highness, his Heirs and Successors, or united or annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm.

Here all the Kingdom swears, That none have, or ought to have any Jurisdiction here, who is Forreign. Yet some Papists have been encouraged to take this Oath, by this Evasion.

Obj.

Obj. No Jurisdiction is here disclaimed of Forreigners, but what belongs to the King : But Spiritual Jurisdiction, called the Power of the Keys, belongs not to the King : *Ergo*.

Ans. For securing the King's Jurisdiction, All Forreign Jurisdiction is renounced ; signifying that there is no such thing as a Jurisdiction over this Realm, but the King's and his Officers. The Power of the Keys, or Spiritual Power, is not properly a Jurisdiction, as that word includeth Legislation, but only a Preaching of Christ's Laws, and administering his Sacraments, and judging of mens capacity for Communion according to those Laws of Christ : And this under the Coercive Government of the King. Much like that of a Tutor in a Colledge, or a Physician in his Hospital. What can be more expressely said than this here, that [" No Forreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate, have, or ought to have " any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence or Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual within this Realm.] Is that of Pope or " Councils neither Ecclesiastical nor Spiritual ? Is not the word [*Prelate*] purposely put in to exclude that Power hence which Prelates claim ? Though the King claim not the Power of the Keys, he knew that by the claim of that Power the Pope and Councils of Forreigners had been the disturbers of his Government : And therefore all theirs here is excluded as a necessary means to secure his own.

1. Popes and Councils have claimed a Legislative Power over us and all the Church : But the Laws of this Land know no such but in Christ over all, and in King and Parliament under him
over

over this Land: And therefore the Oath excludeth the Power claimed by Popes and Councils.

2. As to Judicial Power, these Forreigners claim a Power of Judging who in *England* shall be taken for a true Bishop and Minister; who shall have Tythes, Church-Lands and Temples; whether the Kings, Lords, and all Subjects, shall be judged capable of Church-Communion, or be Excommunicate: And our Laws declaring that all this Forreign Claim is Usurpation, fully proveth that it was the sense of the Oath to exclude them.

They claim also a Power of Judging who shall pass here for Orthodox, and who for Hereticks: And in their Laws the consequence is, who shall be burned for a Heretick, or be exterminated, or after Excommunication deposed from their Dominions, and their Subjects absolved from their Allegiance? But certainly the Oath excludeth them from all this.

The most of the Papists claim no Power directly due to their Pope, but that which they call Ecclesiastical or Spiritual (the rest is but by consequence, and *in ordine ad Spiritualia*:) But if this be not excluded in the Oath, then they intended not to exclude the Papacy: And then what was the Oath made for, or what sense hath it, or what use? And who can believe this?

If the meaning of the Oath be not to exclude the Pope's Ecclesiastical Power, then they that take it may yet hold that the Pope is Head of all the Churches on Earth, and hath the Authority to call, and dissolve, and approve, or reprobate General Councils, and may Ordain Bishops for *England*, and his Ordinations and his Missionaries be here received, and Appeals made to him, and Obedi-

Obedience sworn to him, his Excommunications, Indulgences, imposed Penances, Silencings, Absolutions, Prohibitions here received : All which our Statutes, Articles, Canons, &c. shew notoriously to be false. It is evident therefore that this Oath renounceth all Forreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

II. The second proof is from many Acts of Parliament : Those which prohibit all that receive Orders beyond Sea from the Pope, or any Papists, to come into *England*, on pain of death : Those that forbid the Doctrine, Worship and Discipline both of Popes and Councils : The words of 25 *H. 8. c. 21.* are these.

“Whereas this Realm recognizing no Superiour
 “under God but the King, hath been, and is free
 “from Subjection to any man’s Laws, but only
 “such as have been devised, made and ordained
 “within this Realm for the wealth thereof, or to
 “such other as the People of this Realm, have taken at their free liberty by their own consent
 “to be used among them, and have bound themselves by long use and custom to the observance
 “of the same ; not to the observance of the Laws
 “of any Forreign Prince, Potentate or Prelate ;
 “but as to the accustomed and antient Laws of
 “this Realm, originally Established as Laws of
 “the same, by the said sufferance, consent and custom, and none otherwise : It standeth therefore with natural equity and good reason, &c.
 “that they may abrogate them, &c.

Moreover the Laws of *England* determine, that no Canons are here obligatory, or are Laws, unless made such by King and Parliament. And if it be true which *Heylin*, and some others say, that the

the Pope's Canon-Laws are all here in force still, except those that are contrary to some Laws of the Realm, that is but as the Roman Civil Law is in force; not as a Law of the Pope or old Romans, but as made Laws to us by King and Parliament. The Roman Senate and Emperor give us the Matter of the Civil Law, and the Pope and Councils of the Canon-Law; but the Sovereign Power here giveth them the *Form* of a Law; as the King coineth Forreign Silver.

III. The Articles of Religion prove the same.

I. The twenty first Article saith,

“General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes: And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of Men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God) they may err and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God: Wherefore things ordained by them; as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength nor Authority unless it may be declared that they are taken out of the Holy Scriptures.

Here note, 1. That General Councils (so called) in the Empire, had no power to meet, much less to Rule, without the Commandment of Princes. And so those called by the Emperor had no power over the Subjects of other Princes.

2. And true Universal Councils will never be Lawfully called, till either all the Earth have One Humane Monarch, or all the Heathen, Infidel, Mahometan, Papist, Heretical and Protestant Princes agree to call them: For one hath not Power over the Dominions of all the rest. And so the Aristocratical Party put the whole Church under

der an impossible and non-existent unifying and governing Power.

3. That which may be proved a Duty out of God's Word, was such before any Pope or Council made Laws for it. So that if their Commands herein are any more than declarative, and subservient to God's Laws (as the Crying of a Proclamation, or as a Justices Warrant,) God hath fore-stalled them by his Laws, and theirs come too late.

And if all the Power that Councils or Bishops have as to Legislation, be to make Laws unnecessary to Salvation, it were to be wished they had never made those that are hinderances to Salvation, and set the Churches together by the Ears, and have divided them these 1200 Years and more. Surely our English Canons 5, 6, 7, 8, which Excommunicate so many faithful Christians, do much hinder Salvation, if they be not necessary to it.

But it's apparent that they take their Laws to be necessary to Salvation ; 1. Who say All are Schismaticks that obey them not ; and that such Schismaticks are Mortal Sinners in a state of Damnation. They that make their Canonical Obedience necessary to avoid Schism, and that necessary to Salvation, make the said Canonical Obedience necessary to Salvation. But, &c.

2. And one would think that they that torment, and burn Men, and silence Ministers for not obeying their Canons, made them necessary to Salvation.

The 34th Article saith, That [*every Particular or National Church hath Authority to Ordain, Change, or Abolish Ceremonies or Rites* of

“ of the Church, ordained only by Man’s Authority, so that all things be done to edifying.]

And if so, they that may abolish the Rites ordained by General Councils, or Popes, are not their Subjects: nor is this Power of making and abolishing Rites reserved to them, nor can they deprive any National or Particular Church of this their own Power.

The 36th Article saith, That [“ The Book of Consecration of Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Ordaining of Priests, &c. doth *Contain all things necessary thereto.*]

But nothing in that Book doth make it necessary that English Bishops or Priests receive their Power or Office from any Foreigners, Pope, Council or Bishops; which yet must be necessary if they be their Subjects.

The 37th Article saith, That [“ *Though the Queen hath not the Power of administering the Word and Sacraments, yet she is not, nor ought not to be subject to any foreign Jurisdiction; And that the Bishop of Rome hath no Jurisdiction in this Realm of England.*]

And if so, then he hath no Patriarchal Jurisdiction here; nor have foreign Councils any.

IV. King *Edw. 6.* Injunctions say, That [“ No manner of Obedience or Subjection is due to the Bishop of *Rome* within this Realm.] Therefore not as to a Patriarch, President or *Principum Unitatis.*

V. Queen *Elizabeth’s* Injunctions say, [“ No manner of Obedience or Subjection is due to any such foreign Power-----And Admonit. [No other foreign Power shall or ought to have any Authority over them.]

VI. The

Obedience sworn to him, his Excommunications, Indulgences, imposed Penances, Silencings, Absolutions, Prohibitions here received: All which our Statutes, Articles, Canons, &c. shew notoriously to be false. It is evident therefore that this Oath renounceth all Forreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

II. The second proof is from many Acts of Parliament: Those which prohibit all that receive Orders beyond Sea from the Pope, or any Papists, to come into *England*, on pain of death: Those that forbid the Doctrine, Worship and Discipline both of Popes and Councils: The words of 25 H. 8. c. 21. are these.

“Whereas this Realm recognizing no Superiour
 “under God but the King, hath been, and is free
 “from Subjection to any man’s Laws, but only
 “such as have been devised, made and ordained
 “within this Realm for the wealth thereof, or to
 “such other as the People of this Realm, have taken
 “at their free liberty by their own consent
 “to be used among them, and have bound themselves
 “by long use and custom to the observance
 “of the same; not to the observance of the Laws
 “of any Forreign Prince, Potentate or Prelate;
 “but as to the accustomed and antient Laws of
 “this Realm, originally Established as Laws of
 “the same, by the said sufferance, consent and custom,
 “and none otherwise: It standeth therefore
 “with natural equity and good reason, &c.
 “that they may abrogate them, &c.

Moreover the Laws of *England* determine, that no Canons are here obligatory, or are Laws, unless made such by King and Parliament. And if it be true which *Heylin*, and some others say, that
 the

the Pope's Canon-Laws are all here in force still, except those that are contrary to some Laws of the Realm, that is but as the Roman Civil Law is in force; not as a Law of the Pope or old Romans, but as made Laws to us by King and Parliament. The Roman Senate and Emperor give us the Matter of the Civil Law, and the Pope and Councils of the Canon-Law; but the Sovereign Power here giveth them the *Form* of a Law; as the King coineth Forreign Silver.

III. The Articles of Religion prove the same.

1. The twenty first Article saith,

“General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes: And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of Men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God) they may err and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God: Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength nor Authority unless it may be declared that they are taken out of the Holy Scriptures. —

Here note, 1. That General Councils (so called) in the Empire, had no power to meet, much less to Rule, without the Commandment of Princes. And so those called by the Emperor had no power over the Subjects of other Princes.

2. And true Universal Councils will never be Lawfully called, till either all the Earth have One Humane Monarch, or all the Heathen, Infidel, Mahometan, Papist, Heretical and Protestant Princes agree to call them: For one hath not Power over the Dominions of all the rest. And so the Aristocratical Party put the whole Church under

der an impossible and non-existent unifying and governing Power.

3. That which may be proved a Duty out of God's Word, was such before any Pope or Council made Laws for it. So that if their Commands herein are any more than declarative, and subservient to God's Laws (as the Crying of a Proclamation, or as a Justices Warrant,) God hath forestalled them by his Laws, and theirs come too late.

And if all the Power that Councils or Bishops have as to Legislation, be to make Laws unnecessary to Salvation, it were to be wished they had never made those that are hinderances to Salvation, and set the Churches together by the Ears, and have divided them these 1200 Years and more. Surely our English Canons 5, 6, 7, 8, which Excommunicate so many faithful Christians, do much hinder Salvation, if they be not necessary to it.

But it's apparent that they take their Laws to be necessary to Salvation; 1. Who say All are Schismaticks that obey them not; and that such Schismaticks are Mortal Sinners in a state of Damnation. They that make their Canonical Obedience necessary to avoid Schism, and that necessary to Salvation, make the said Canonical Obedience necessary to Salvation. But, &c.

2. And one would think that they that torment, and burn Men, and silence Ministers for not obeying their Canons, made them necessary to Salvation.

The 34th Article saith, That [*every Particular or National Church hath Authority to Ordain, Change, or Abolish Ceremonies or Rites* of

“ of the Church, ordained only by Man's Authority, so that all things be done to edifying.]

And if so, they that may abolish the Rites ordained by General Councils, or Popes, are not their Subjects: nor is this Power of making and abolishing Rites reserved to them, nor can they deprive any National or Particular Church of this their own Power.

The 36th Article saith, That [“ The Book of Consecration of Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Ordaining of Priests, &c. doth [Contain all things necessary thereto.]

But nothing in that Book doth make it necessary that English Bishops or Priests receive their Power or Office from any Foreigners, Pope, Council or Bishops; which yet must be necessary if they be their Subjects.

The 37th Article saith, That [“ Though the Queen hath not the Power of administering the Word and Sacraments, yet she is not, nor ought not to be subject to any foreign Jurisdiction; And that the Bishop of Rome hath no Jurisdiction in this Realm of England.] And if so, then he hath no Patriarchal Jurisdiction here; nor have foreign Councils any.

IV. King *Edw. 6.* Injunctions say, That [“ No manner of Obedience or Subjection is due to the Bishop of Rome within this Realm.] Therefore not as to a Patriarch, President or *Principum Unitatis.*

V. Queen *Elizabeth's* Injunctions say, [“ No manner of Obedience or Subjection is due to any such foreign Power-----And Admonit. [No other foreign Power shall or ought to have any Authority over them.]

VI. The

VI. The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiast.* c. 9, 10, 11, 14, 15. are full proof: There the Reformers professing reverence to the 4 first General Councils as holding sound Doctrine, add [“ *Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censimus, nisi quatenus ex S. Scripturis confirmari possint: Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, & contraria inter se definitivisse; partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide manifestum est. Itaque legantur Concilia quidem, cum honore & Christiana reverentia, sed interim ad Scripturarum piam, certam, rectamq; regulam examinentur.*”

C. 15. “*Orthodoxorum Patrum etiam auctoritatem minime censemus esse contemnendam; sunt enim permulta ab illis præclare & utiliter dicta: ut tamen ex eorum Sententia de Sacris Literis judicetur, non admittimus: Debent enim sacræ literæ, nobis omnis Doctrinæ Christianæ & regulæ esse & iudices. Quin & ipsi Patres tantum honoris sibi deferri recusarunt, sapius admonentes lectorem ut tantisper suas admittat sententias & interpretationes, quoad cum sacris literis consentire eas animadverterit.*”

Et de Hæres. c. 1. “*Illorum intolerabilis est error qui totius Christiani orbis universam Ecclesiam solius Episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt. Nos enim eam quæ cerni potest Ecclesiam sic definitimus, ut omnium cætus sit fidelium hominum, in quo S. Scriptura sincerè docetur; & Sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quæ necessaria sunt) juxta Christi præscriptum administrantur.*”

Et de Judic. Cont. Hæres. c. 1. “*Appellatio reo conceditur ab Episcopo ad Archiepiscopum, & ab Archiepiscopo ad Regiam personam (but no further) Vid. de Eccles. c. 10. de Episc. Potestate.*”

Et pag. 190. " *Rex tam in Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, Clericos, & alias Ministros quàm in Laicos intra sua regna & dominia plenissimam jurisdictionem tam civilem quàm Ecclesiasticam habet, & exercere potest: Cum omnis Jurisdictio tum Ecclesiastica tum secularis ab eo tanquam ex uno & eodem fonte derivantur.*

Et de Appell. c. II. " There's no Appeal to any above or beyond the King, judging by a Provincial Council, or Select Bishops.]

Though the King died before these were made Laws, they tell us the Church of *England's* since.

VII. To save transcribing, I desire the Reader to peruse that notable Letter of King *Henry* the 8th to the Archbishop of *York*: It is the first in the second Part of the Caballa of Letters; well worth the reading, to our purpose.

VIII. The Liturgy for *Nov. 1.* called the Pope Antichrist, And the Homilies to the same since: And the Convocation in *Ireland*, Art. 8. 1615. do both the Parliament of *England*, in the Act for the Subsidy 3 *Jacobi*, of the Clergy. And are they that took him for Antichrist, thought not that as Pope or Patriarch he had any ruling power here.

IX. The Apology of the Church of *England* in *Jewel's Works*, (ordered to be kept in all the parish Churches) faith, Pag. 708.

["Of a truth even those greatest Councils, and where most Assemblies of People ever were, (whereof these Men use to make such exceeding reckoning) compare them with all the Churches which throughout the World acknowledge and profess the Name of Christ, and what

Et

" else

VI. The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiast.* c. 9, 10, 11. 14, 15. are full proof: There the Reformers professing reverence to the 4 first General Councils as holding sound Doctrine, add [“ *Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censemus, nisi quatenus ex S. Scripturis confirmari possint: Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, & contraria inter se definiuisse, partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide manifestum est. Itaque legantur Concilia quidem, cum honore & Christiana reverentia, sed interim ad Scripturarum piam, certam, rectamq; regulam examinentur.*”

C. 15. “*Orthodoxorum Patrum etiam auctoritatem minime censemus esse contemnendam; sunt enim permulta ab illis præclare & utiliter dicta: ut tamen ex eorum Sententia de Sacris Literis judicetur, non admittimus: Debent enim sacræ literæ, nobis omnis Doctrinæ Christianæ & regulæ esse & iudices. Quin & ipsi Patres tantum honoris sibi deferri recusarunt, sapiens admonentes lectorem ut tantisper suæ admittat sententias & interpretationes, quoad cum sacris literis consentire eas animadverterit.*”

Et de Hæres. c. 1. “*Illorum intolerabilis est error qui totius Christiani orbis universam Ecclesiam solius Episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt. Nos enim eam quæ cerni potest Ecclesiam sic definimus, ut omnium cætus sit fidelium hominum, in quo S. Scriptura sincerè docetur; & Sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quæ necessaria sunt) juxta Christi præscriptum administrantur.*”

Et de Judic. Cont. Hæres. c. 1. “*Appellatio reo conceditur ab Episcopo ad Archiepiscopum, & ab Archiepiscopo ad Regiam personam (but no further) Vid. de Eccles. c. 10. de Episc. Potestate.*”

Et

Et pag. 190. " *Rex tam in Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, Clericos, & alias Ministros quàm in Laicos intra sua regna & dominia plenissimam jurisdictionem tam civilem quàm Ecclesiasticam habet, & exercere potest: Cum omnis Jurisdictio tum Ecclesiastica tum secularis ab eo tanquam ex uno & eodem fonte derivantur.*

Et de Appell. c. 11. " *There's no Appeal to any above or beyond the King, judging by a Provincial Council, or Select Bishops.*]

Though the King died before these were made Laws, they tell us the Church of *England's* since.

VII. To save transcribing, I desire the Reader to peruse that notable Letter of King *Henry* the 8th to the Archbishop of *York*: It is the first in the second Part of the Caballa of Letters; well worth the reading, to our purpose.

VIII. The Liturgy for *Nov. 1.* called the Pope Antichrist, And the Homilies to the same since: And the Convocation in *Ireland*, Art. 8. 1615. So doth the Parliament of *England*, in the Act for the Subsidy 3 *Jacobi*, of the Clergy. And sure they that took him for Antichrist, thought not that as Pope or Patriarch he had any ruling Power here.

IX. The Apology of the Church of *England* in *Jewel's Works*, (ordered to be kept in all the Parish Churches) faith, Pag. 708.

["Of a truth even those greatest Councils, and where most Assemblies of People ever were, (whereof these Men use to make such exceeding reckoning) compare them with all the Churches which throughout the World acknowledge and profess the Name of Christ, and what
" else

" else I pray you can they seem to be but certain
 " Private Councils of Bishops, and Provincial
 " Synods? For admit peradventure Italy, France,
 " Spain, England, Germany, Denmark, Scotland,
 " met together; If there want Asia, Greece, Ar-
 " menia, Persia, Media, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Etbio-
 " pia, India, Mauritania, in all which Places
 " there be both many Christians, and many Bi-
 " shops, how can any Man, being in his right
 " Mind, think such a Council to be a General
 " Council?]

Pag. 629. " It's proved that Councils have been
 " so factious and tyrannical, that good Men have
 " justly refused to come at them.

Pag. 593. " But the Gospel hath been carried
 " on without and against Councils; and Councils
 " been against the Truth.

And Jewel, Pag. 486. sheweth that [" Councils
 " have been against Councils, and the Arrian He-
 " reticks had more Councils than the Christians.]
 and sheweth their uncertainty.

Pag. 19. As to the Authority of Councils, Au-
 gustine saith, ["*Ipsa plenaria Concilia saepe Priora
 posterioribus emendantur.*"

And of the Succession and Ordination of Bi-
 shops, he saith, Pag. 131. [" If there were not
 " one of them (that turned from Popery) or of
 " us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole
 " Church of England fly to Lovaine. Tertullian
 " saith, *Nonne & Laici sacerdotes sumus. — Ubi Ec-
 " clesiastici Ordinis non est Confessus, & offert &
 " tingit sacerdos qui est solus. Sed & ubi tres sunt,
 " Ecclesia est, licet Laici.* And frequently he saith,
 " The Church is found among few, as well as
 " among many.] And he was for Lay Mens Bap-
 tizing.

X. The first Canon commandeth Preachers Four times a Year to declare [“That All usurped
“ & foreign Power (forasmuch as the same hath no
“ Establishment nor Ground by the Law of God)
“ is for most just Causes taken away and abolished.
“ And that therefore, No manner of Obedience
“ or Subjection within His Majesties Realms and
“ Dominions is due to any such foreign Power.

The 12th Canon Excommunicateth *ipso facto* any that shall affirm, “That it is lawful for any
“ sort of Ministers to joyn together and make
“ Rules, Orders or Constitutions, in Causes Eccle-
“ siastical, without the King’s Authority, and shall
“ submit themselves to be ruled and governed by
“ them.] Therefore none may go beyond Sea to
Councils without his Authority. And the Canons
of Foreigners are not to be made a Rule without
his Authority. And is not other Princes Authority
as necessary in their Dominions?

The Canon which bids Prayer 55th describeth
[“Christ’s holy Catholick Church to be the whole
“ Congregation of Christian People dispersed
“ throughout the whole World.] But such a
Church hath no Legislative or Judicial Power.

XI. The Controversie is about an Article of
Faith, [I believe the holy Catholick Church.] The
Humanists say, It is an universal Political Society,
Governed by one humane Supream, (Monarch,
Aristocracy or mixt) under Christ. Protestants
say, It hath no universal supream Ruler but Christ.
Now the Generality of Protestant English and
transmarine, who write on the Creed, expound this
Article accordingly in the Protestant sence; as he
that will peruse their Books may find; which
sheweth what is the sence of the Church of England.

XII. Though King *Edw. VI.* was but a Youth when he wrote his sharp Book against Popery, (lately printed.) It sheweth what his Tutors and the Clergy of his time, who were called the Church, then thought of these Matters.

XIII. If the Parliaments of *England* all the days of *Queen Elizabeth*, King *James*, and King *Charles I. and II.* knew what was the Doctrine of the Church of *England* about a Forreign Jurisdiction, it is easie to gather it in their Votes, and Acts. Let him that would know whether they were for a Coalition with the French on such terms, read Sir *Simon Demes Journals*, *Rushworths Collections*, or *Prins Introduction ad annum 1621.* or any other true Historian, and he will see how far they were from owning any Forreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. But the contrary minded would make the World believe that all these Parliaments were of some Sect differing from the Church of *England*. But what call they the Church of *England* but that part of the Clergy who conform to the Laws: And did not the Law-makers understand the Laws?

Or if they more regard the sence of the Clergy, let them read A. Bishop *Abbor's* very plain and bold Letter to the King, in *Prin's* Introduct. pag. 39, 40. and Dr. *Hackwell's*, &c. and they may know what was then the sence of the Clergy: With whom concurred the Bishops of *Ireland*: Insomuch that Bishop *Downame* expressing his sence of the Papists there, and his contrary desires, presumed to add, [*And let all the people say Amen;*] at which the Church rang with the *Amen*. And though he was questioned in *England* for it, he came safe off. His Neighbour Bi-
shops

shops also declaring Popery to be Idolatry, and the Pope Antichrist.

XIV. The Bishops and chief Writers of *England* have taken the Pope to be the Antichrist; *Cranmer, Whitgift, Parker, Grindall, Abbot*, all A. Bishops of *Canterbury*; *Usher, Downname, Jewel, Andrews, Bilson, Latimer, Hooper, Farrar, Ridley, Robert Abbot, Hall, Allig*, and abundance more Bishops: The Martyrs, *Sutcliffe, Fulke, Sharp, Whittaker, Willet, Crakenthorp*, and most of our Writers against Popery. Sure then they were for none of his Jurisdiction here.

XV. The Prayers have been and are to this day added in the end both to our Bibles and Common Prayer Books, which shew how far the Church of *England* was from desiring a Coalition with the Papists by submitting to any Forreign Jurisdiction: They say to God, [" Confound Satan and " Antichrist, with all Hirelings, whom thou hast " already cast off into a reprobate sense, that they " may not by Sects, Schisms, Heresies, and Er- " rors, disquiet thy little Flock. And because, " O Lord, we be fallen into the latter days and " dangerous times, wherein Ignorance hath got " the upper hand, and Satan by his Ministers seek- " eth by all means to quench the light of thy Gos- " pel, we beseech thee to maintain thy Cause a- " gainst those ravening Wolves, and strengthen all " thy Servants whom they keep in Prison and Bon- " dage. Let not thy long-suffering be an occasion " either to increase their tyranny, or to discou- " rage thy Children, &c.]

Though A. Bishop *Land* put out all these Prayers from the Scots new Liturgy, we had never had them still bound with ours to this day if the Church

Church of *England* had not at first approved them.

There is also a Confession of Faith found with them, describing the Catholick Church as we do.

XVI. The Oath called *Et Cetera* of 1640. saith that [“The Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England* containeth all things necessary to Salvation.”] Therefore Obedience to any Forreign Jurisdiction is not necessary to Salvation: And therefore not necessary to the avoiding of Schism, or any Damning Sin.

XVII. The Church of *England* holdeth that no Forreigners (Pope or Prelates) have Judicial Power to pronounce the King of *England* a Heretick. Or Excommunicate, (though as Bishop *Andrews* saith in *Tortura Torti* even a Deacon may refuse to deliver him the Sacrament if uncapable, much more that Pastor whom he chuseth to deliver it him.) For it's known by sad experience how dismal the Consequences are; exposing the lives of the Excommunicate to danger among them that believe the Pope and his Councils, and rendering them dishonoured and contemned by their Subjects: We know how many Emperors have been deposed as Excommunicate, and what Queen *Elizabeth's* Excommunication tended to; And if our Laws make it Treason to publish such an Excommunication, sure the Law-makers believed not that either Pope or Prelates had a Judicial Power to do it. In *Prin's* *Introduct.* p. 121. the Papists that were unwilling to be the Executioners, had no better plea, than [That no Council had yet judged the King to be a Heretick.] But Protestants deny that any Council hath a Judicial Power so to judge him, though all Men have
a Dis-

a Discerning Power to judge with whom they should hold Communion.

But if our Defenders of a Forreign Power say true, then the Universal Judge (Pope or Prelates) may Judge and Excommunicate Kings who they think deserve it. And if so, not only Justice, but Humanity requireth that such Kings be first heard speak for themselves, and answer their Accusers Face to Face. And this can seldom be well done by proxy, as the Prelates will not Excommunicate the Proxies or Advocates only. And must all Emperors and Kings travel no Man knows whither or how far to answer every such accusation, and that at the Bar of a Priest, that's Subject to another Prince, (perhaps his Enemy ;) And if it be at an Universal Council, the King of *England* may be Summoned to *America* or *Constantinople*, at nearest, if they must be indifferently called together.

XVIII. The Church of *England* is not for Popery, but against it: But the Doctrine of an Universal Church Sovereign under Christ, is Popery; by the Confession of Protestants and Papists. I. Protestants ordinarily rank the Papists into these sorts, differing from each other. 1. Those that place the Universal Supream Power in the Pope alone, (which are most of the Italians that dwell near him.) 2. Those that place it in a Pope and General Council agreeing, (which are the greatest number.) 3. Those that place it in a General Council as above the Pope, especially if they disagree. 4. Those that place it in the Universal Church real or diffusive. See Dr. *Challoner* in his *Crede Ecclesiam Catholicam*, describing these four sorts of Papists.

II. And the Papists themselves number all the same differences, as you may see in *Bellarmino* at large.

Of the first Opinion is *Valentia in Thom. To. 3. Disp. 1. p. 7. § 45.* and divers others both Jesuits, Friars and Seculars. And *Albert. Pighius* hath written an unanswerable Book against the Supremacy of Councils. But *Bellarmino* himself saith, of this way, ["*Usq; ad hanc diem questio superest etiam inter Catholicos. Lib. 2. de Concil. c. 13.*"] And they that have different Sovereigns have different Churches.

Of the second Opinion are the greatest number of their Doctors.

Of the third Opinion (for a Councils Supremacy above and against the Pope in case of disagreement) were the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*; And saith *Bellarmino*, *Joh. Gerson*, *Petr. de Alliaco Card. Cameracensis*, *Jacobus Almanius*, *Card. Nicol. Cusanus*, *Card. Florentinus*, *Panormitanus*, *Tostatatus Abulensis*, and multitudes more; with *Oviedo*, *Okam*, &c. and the Parisians and French Church: And the Pope and Jesuits will not say that all these are Protestants, or none of the *Roman* Church: And the Church of *England* never took them for any other than Papists.

XIX. The small Book called *Deus & Rex*, which is approved by the Church of *England*, may give the Reader satisfaction herein.

XX. The common strain of the most approved Doctors of the Church in their Licensed Books against the Papists, disclaimeth all Forreign Jurisdiction of Pope or Prelates.

1. Bishop *Jewel* I before cited,

2. Bishop *Bilson* is too large to be recited. Of
Christian

Christian Subj. p. 229. "[To Councils (saith he)
 " such as the Church of Christ was wont by the
 " help of her Religious Princes to call, we owe
 " Communion and brotherly Concord, so long
 " as they make no breach in Faith and Christian
 " Charity; *Subjection* and *Servitude* we owe
 " them none.] See more p. 270, 271, 272, 273; &c.
 of the Errours and Contradictions of General
 Councils, and how the major Vote obligeth us
 not to follow them.

And pag. 233. [The Title and Authority of
 A. Bishops and Patriarchs was not ordained by the
 Commandment of Christ or his Apostles, but the
 Bishops long after, when the Church began to be
 troubled with Dissentions, were contented to link
 themselves together in every Province to suffer
 one—to assemble the rest. " Pag. 261. The
 Bishops speaking the Word of God, Princes as
 well as others must yield Obedience: But if
 " Bishops pass their Commission, and speak be-
 " side the Word of God, what they list, both Prince
 " and People may despise them.

3. Dr. *Fulke* on *Eph. 1. § 5.* sheweth that the
 Church hath no Head but Christ, and no man can
 be so much as a Ministerial Head.

4. Dr. *Reynolds* against *Hart* proveth, that none
 but Christ can be the Head of Government any
 more than the Head of Influence.

5. Dr. *Whitaker* against *Stapleton de sacra Script.*
 pag. 128. " He sheweth his Ignorance as worthy
 " to sit among the Catechumens, that instead of
 " Believing that there is a Catholick Church,
 " puts [believing what the Catholick saith and be-
 " lieveth [sic tu, ut novam tuam fidem defendas ne-
 " vos articulos condis, etiam non hæresis sed perfidia
 " Magister

"*Magister es*] I believe that there is a holy Catholick Church, but that I must believe all that it believeth and teacheth, I believe not. Augustine appealed from the *Nicene* Council to the Scripture. We receive not the Baptism of Infants from the Authority of the Church, but from the Scripture. And pag. 103. he sheweth that [Councils have erred, and corrected one another, and are more uncertain than the Scripture. And pag. 50. [The Peace of the Church is better secured by referring all to the Scripture than to the Church.

"Pag. 501. The Catholick Church in the Creed is invisible, and known only by Faith.

6. See Bishop Hall's, *No Peace with Rome*, and his Letter to *Land*. It is tedious to cite all in *Willet*, *Slater*, *Prideaux*, *Abbot*, *Marton*, *Crakenthorpe*, *Challoner*, *White*, and the rest to this purpose.

It is most notorious, that the Church of *England* was against all Forreign Jurisdiction of Pope or Prelates as over this Land.

To cite a multitude of such Testimonies, would but needlessly swell the Book, and weary the Reader.

Chap. II. *The whole Kingdom and Church is sworn against all Forreign Jurisdiction, and all alteration of Government in Church and State: And ought not to be stigmatized with PERJURY.*

§ 1. **T**HAT the whole Church and Kingdom is under such Oaths is visible.

I. The

I. The Oath of Supremacy before cited against All Forreign Jurisdiction is put upon all the Land.

II. The Oath called *Et cetera* 1640. is against Change of Government, and was taken by many.

III. The Act of Uniformity obligeth the whole Ministry to subscribe against all endeavours to alter the Government.

IV. The *Oxford* Act of Confinement sweareth all Nonconformists (and more) never to endeavour any Alteration of Government in Church or State.

V. The Vestry Act sweareth all the Parish Vestries to the same.

VI. The Corporation Act sweareth all the Cities and Corporations of *England* to the same ; that is, All in Power and Trust as to Government.

VII. The Militia Act sweareth all the Souldiers of the Land to the same.

So that it is undeniable that all the Kingdom is sworn never to endeavour any Alteration of Government in Church or State, and also expressly against all Forreign Jurisdiction.

§ 2. That it is not only an Alteration, but even an Alteration of the very Species or Constitution of Church and State Government, to bring the Land under the Forreign Jurisdiction either of Pope, Prince or Prelates, I have proved by it self ; and to any man of understanding, it needs no proof.

§ 3. That Church and State, and the whole Land ought not be wilfully perjured, is clear. 1. It is so heinous a sin against God, as is like to bring down destructive vengeance : He that threatneth it even in the Tables of Stone : *The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain* : And Perjury

is

is the chief taking his Name in vain, to confirm a Lie. And if this threatning reach to every individual, what will become of perjured Church and Kingdom? The Lord is the avenger of all such crimes: And it's a fearful thing to fall into the hands of this God, who is a consuming fire.

II. "Perjury is a direct dissolution of Societies: "Mutual Trust is their concernment: Utter Distrust is a Virtual death or war. King and People are tied to each other by Oaths: Majors and chief Officers, and Judges are tied to fidelity by Oaths. The Bishops swear their Clergy to them, (though old Canons condemned it:) Loose this Bond, and what are Societies? Who can trust him that maketh no conscience of the Obligation of Oaths, any more than an Enemy?

III. It depriveth the King of a necessary means of security for his life. If all conscience of the Oaths of Allegiance were gone, it is supposed that the conscience of Loyalty would be gone. And many a Traytor would study how to kill Kings secretly without danger to themselves, or to make it good by strength and numbers.

IV. It depriveth all the Subjects of necessary Security for Estate, Name or Life. If Church and State should openly be perjured, who can expect that all Individuals should stick at it? But rather that every Man that hath an Enemy, or hath either Wealth or Place which another desireth, should presently be Sworn to the Gallows or the Block? It were far better dwell among Toads, Snakes, and Adders, or Wolves and Bears against whom a Man hath some defence: *Homo homini Lupus*, would be turned into *Homo homini Diabolus*.

V. It would make us incapable of Trust, Traffick, and Friendship with any Forreign Land: Open National Perjury is so odious against the Light and Law of Nature, that Englishmen would be to other Lands, as Man-eating Canibals are to us. None could treat with us or trust us.

VI. This would be a most heinous wrong to the King, to have the History of his Reign so odiously blotted to all Posterity, as that under him the Land should be turned to Diabolism, and made the hatred and scorn of all the Earth; when God had honoured it with so many Blessings above most others.

VII. It would render Popery it self more odious than it is, as if it lived by the most horrid crimes, and must revive by National Perjury: And would confirm those self-conceited Whimsical Expositors of *Rev. 13.* that think the mark in the Forehead imposed upon all that must buy and sell, and be Freemen is PERjury with PERsecution; and that dream that the Letters of the Name of the Beast, are not to be understood meerly *Numerally*, but *Materially* and *Nominally*, and that χ ξ ς $\alpha\alpha$ $\chi\iota$, *sigma-tau* are our Ch. and St. conjoynd by a Serpentine [X] or [and] to signify that our Swearing and Forswearing was for [Church and State.] Yea and the more odious fancy of another Name in them will become their Sport.

VIII. It would make the Nonconformists say that never Men on Earth were dealt with so inhumanely, and Challenge the World to give any such instance in any History, Christian, Mahometan or Pagan, if the same men that have reviled them

them as Rebellious, and endeavoured their Imprisonment and utter Ruine for not Swearing never to endeavour any alteration of Government, should all this while be designing the alteration of it, and first to make all men abjure it, and after to bring them to it. The Dissenters scruple not Swearing never to Endeavour the Altering of the State, Government, nor of the Church as in the Hands of such Pastors as Christ or his Apostles instituted; nor any Reformation by Sedition or unlawful Means: But they durst not absolutely abjure all Lawful Endeavour, to take the Church Keys out of Lay-mens Hands, and to have more Bishops than one to many score or hundred Churches, &c. And if we must lye in Jails as Rogues for refusing this for fear of Perjury, and yet the Reverend or other Prosecutors should so far alter all the Government of Church and State as to bring all the Land under a Forreign Jurisdiction, Legislative, Judicial and Executive, and to make King, Parliament, Clergy and People the Subjects of the Pope, or which is more base, of a Court or Colledge of Prelates who are almost all Subjects to Forreign Papists, Mahometans and Heathens, of whom few dare disobey their Lords and Princes, this would be such a thing as Humane Language hath no words significant enough to describe.

§ 4. *Obj. Sinful Oaths bind none, and must be broken.*

Ans. 1. Sinful Oaths involve Men in the dreadful guilt of Perjury.

2. Oaths sinfully imposed and taken, yet bind to Lawful Matter.

3. If

3. If these Oaths be sinful, why were they imposed? Shall the same Men urge all to take them, and then say, You may break them as being sinful?

4. It is not sinful to Swear Loyalty and Self-defence against foreign Enemies or Usurpers.

Obj. 2. *Luther* and your other Reformers broke their Vow of Chastity and Obedience to the Pope, and defended it.

Ans. 1. You think they did ill, and will that justify you?

2. To obey a Pope, that is by Usurpation a Vice-Christ, or King of all the World, is a great Sin, and they that Swear it, are no more bound to it, than they that Swear Murder or Treason. And the Vow of Chastity becomes unlawful to those that have not the Power of Continence. But for those that had, let them justify them from Perjury that can: I cannot.

3. The Perjury of a few Individuals, and of a Kingdom, vastly differ.

4. They took that Oath in ignorance, thinking they had done well. But those that I now speak to, at once reviled them that took it not, and did their best to lay it on all the Land, and yet were then for a Foreign Jurisdiction, and designed or desired that all that took it might after break it.

But these Objectors shew us that there is no Sin so odious and inhumane, which Learned and Reverend Men may not plead for, under a Name and Mask of Virtue, Loyalty, Piety, and the Churches Good and Service.

Obj. The Laws may repeal these Oaths.

Ans.

Answ. That will but free new Men from taking them; but not those that have already Sworn from keeping them in all the lawful parts.

Chap. III. *What Endeavours have been used by the more Moderate Papists to bring England under a Foreign Jurisdiction in King James's time.*

§. 1. **I** Will not meddle now with their violent Attempts abroad and at home, nor so much as name them. (Commonly Known) It is not my design to speak or act offensively, but defensively: Their ways of Wit and Deceit have been many, and among others pretended Motions for a Coalition hath not been the least: And their injurious Pretences that our Rulers have been inclined to them, as knowing how much that may do with the ignorant sequacious Multitude.

§. 2. I. In Queen *Elizabeths* days, they much perswaded her that to go as far from the Church of *Rome* as the Anti-Papists desired, would cross her Interest, and make the reduction of the Kingdom impossible, who were all Papists but as it were the other day.

II. In King *James's* time, they would fain have conquered him by the fear of Murder, when he heard of the Murder of two King's of *France*, *H. 3.* and *H. 4.* that had greater defensive Powers than he: And the Powder Plot was yet more frightful: And continued threatnings more.

And he shewed his peaceable Disposition in promoting the Spanish and French Matches for his

his Son: and especially if it be true that *Rushworth* and other Historians say, that He, and his Son, and his Council took their Oaths for a Toleration; in the words recorded by them.

§. 3. And to make People believe that he was at the heart a Papist, the Bish^{op} of *Ambrun* boasteth of his success in a Conference with him, published in French in Mr. *D'ageant*, printed at *Grenoble* 1668. where in *Pag.* 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178. he tells this Story. (It's like the Archbishop told it to ingratiate himself with Cardinal *Richlieu*, to whom he sent it, and would not scruple aggravation.) 'Afterwards there was a good understanding between the two Crowns: The King of *England* at the request of the K of *France*, did often remit the ordinary severities used against the Catholicks in *England*: He was even well-pleased with the Proposals that were secretly made to him by the King of *France*, in order to the reducing of him into the bosom of the Church. Insomuch, that after several Conferences held for that Effect, by the consent of his Majesty, without communicating any thing of that matter to his Council, for fear that the business being known should have been obstructed; The Archbishop of *Ambrun* passed into *England*, as if it had been without Design, in the Habit and under the Name of a Counsellor of the Parliament of *Grenoble*, whose curiosity had incited him to see *England*. He had no sooner Landed at *Dover*, but the Duke of *Buckingham* came to meet him, and having saluted him thus whispered in his Ear [*Sir, who call your self a Counsellor of Grenoble, but are the Archbishop of Ambrun, you are welcom into these Kingdoms. You*

' need not change your Name nor your Quality, for
 ' here you shall receive nothing but Honour, and espe-
 ' cially from the King my Master, who hath a most
 ' high Esteem of you.] Indeed the King of England
 ' used him most Kindly, and granted him many
 ' Favours on behalf of the Catholicks, and even
 ' permitted him in the French Embassadors
 ' Lodgings where was a great Assembly to admi-
 ' nister the Sacrament of Confirmation to the
 ' Catholicks, the Doors being open, There were
 ' near Eighteen thousand Persons who received
 ' that Sacrament, and yet no man said any thing
 ' to them as they went in at the Gate, nor no
 ' where else. Although there were many of the
 ' English always standing in the Street beholding
 ' the Ceremony. During his abode, he had many
 ' Conferences with that King, who having come
 ' to agreement in all the controverted Points, he
 ' wrote a long Letter to the Pope by a Catholick
 ' Gentleman, his Subject, whom he sent secretly
 ' of purpose, by which Letter he acknowledged
 ' him to be the Vicar General of Jesus Christ, on
 ' Earth, the Universal Father of Christians, and
 ' the Head of all the Catholicks; assuring him
 ' that after he had made sufficient provision with
 ' respect to the things agreed on, he would open-
 ' ly declare himself: In the mean time; he pro-
 ' mised him not to suffer any more to make
 ' search in his Kingdom for the Priests which
 ' were sent over by his Holiness, and the most
 ' Christian King, provided they were no Jesuites,
 ' whom he said he could not trust for many Rea-
 ' sons, chiefly because he counted them to have
 ' been the Authors of the Powder Plot, by
 ' which they had designed to have blown him up

in his Parliament. In his Letter among other things, he intreated the Pope to grant that the Church Lands which had become part of the Patrimony of the principal Houses in *England* might not be taken from them; that on the contrary, they might be permitted to possess them; because if it should be otherwise, there might arise trouble on that account. He said also, that nothing hindred him from declaring himself presently, but that he desired to bring the King of *Denmark* his Brother-in-Law with him; whom he had in order to that end, but under another pretence, prayed to come over into *England*, where he hoped to Convert him with himself. That in so doing he should secure the Peace of his Kingdoms, which otherwise he could hardly keep in Peace, and that they two joyned in the same Design, would draw with them almost all the North. The Duke of *Buckingham* and the Gentleman, whom he sent to *Rome*, were the only Persons of his Subjects to whom he had made known this design. But the Death of King *James*, which put a stop to this Negotiation, put a stop to the Effect of it, which was a matter of great Grief to his Holiness, and the King of *France*.] Thus far *Deageant*: At the End of his Book is a Narrative of the Archbishop of *Ambrun* of his Voyage into *England*, written to Cardinal *Richlieu*. In which he speaks much to the like purpose, as done 1624. adding, 'That the King told him with great freedom the affection he had for the Catholick Faith, and was so particular as not to omit any thing, insomuch that he told me, that from his Childhood his Masters perceiving his inclinations thereto, he

'had run great hazards of being assassinated.)
 The rest is, 'That the King resolved to settle
 'Liberty of Conscience by calling an Assembly
 'of Trusty English and Foreign Divines at *Dover*
 'or *Boloigne*.

I have recited this to shew that as they are not wanting in Art and Industry, so they abuse the Name of Princes to promote their Cause. Who can tell but much of this is Lies? And if King *James* to prevent Butchery, gave them a few fair words, it's like they added more of their own. And if he used the Papists kindly, as being against Cruelty, they were the more unexcusable that would have destroyed him, and could not be kept in Peace.

§. 4. Yet do the Papists make people beyond Sea believe that they live here under constant Martyrdom! Sure if History be to be believed, the Articles of King *James* and his Son, our late King, about the Spanish and French Matches, do acquit both Kings from any just Accusation of Cruelty against the Papists. *Rushworth* aftermentioned thus reciteth the private Articles of the first Match, *Pag.* 86, 87, 88.

1. 'Particular Laws made against Roman Catholics, under which other Vassals of our Realm are not comprehended, and general Laws under which all are equally comprized, if repugnant to the Romish Religion, shall not any time hereafter by any means or chance whatever, directly or indirectly, be commanded to be put in Execution against the said Roman Catholics: And we will cause that our Council shall take the same Oath, as far as it pertains to them, and belongs to the Execution which by them and their Ministers is to be exercised. 2. 'That

2. 'That no other Laws shall hereafter be
'made anew against the said Roman Catholicks;
'but that there shall be a perpetual Toleration of
'the Roman Catholick Religion within Private
'Houses throughout all Our Realms and Domi-
'nions; which We will have to be understood as
'well of Our Kingdoms of *Scotland* and *Ireland*,
'as in *England*; which shall be Granted to them
'in manner and form as is Capitulated, Decreed,
'and Granted in the Articles of the Treaty con-
'cerning the Marriage.

3. 'That neither by Us, nor by any other inter-
'posed Person whatsoever, directly or indirectly,
'privately or publickly, will We Treat or At-
'tempt any thing with the most renowned Lady
'*Infanta Donna Maria*, which shall be repugnant
'to the Roman Catholick Religion: Neither will
'We by any means perswade her that she should
'ever renounce or relinquish the same, in Sub-
'stance or Form, or that she should do any thing
'repugnant or contrary to those things which are
'contained in the Treaty of Marriage.

4. 'That We and the Prince of *Wales* will
'interpose Our Authority, and will do as much
'as in Us shall lye, that the Parliament shall ap-
'prove, confirm and ratifie all and singular Arti-
'cles, in favour of the Roman Catholicks, capi-
'tulated between the most renowned Kings, by
'reason of this Marriage: And that the said
'Parliament shall Revoke and Abrogate parricular
'Laws made against the said Roman Catholicks,
'to whose observance also the rest of Our Sub-
'jects and Vassals are not obliged; as likewise
'the general Laws under which all are equally
'comprehended, to wit, as to the Roman Catho-
'licks,

'licks if they be such as is aforesaid, which are
 'repugnant to the Roman Catholick Religion.
 'And that hereafter we will not consent that the
 'said Parliament shall ever at any time enact or
 'write any other, or new Laws against Roman
 'Catholicks.

'Moreover, I *Charles* Prince of *Wales* engage my
 'self (and promise, that the most Illustrious
 'King of Great *Britain* my most honoured Lord
 'and Father shall do the same both by word and
 'writing) that all those things which are contain-
 'ed in the foregoing Articles, and concern as
 'well the Suspension as the Abrogation of the
 'Laws made against the *Roman* Catholicks shall
 'within three years infallibly take effect, and
 'sooner if it be possible, which we will have to
 'lye upon our Conscience and Royal Honour;
 'that I will interceed with the most Illustrious
 'King of Great *Britain* my Father, that the ten
 'years of the Education of the Children which
 'shall be Born of this Marriage with the most Il-
 'lustrious Lady *Infanta* their Mother, accorded
 'in the Twenty third Article (which term the
 'Pope of *Rome* desires to have prorogued to twelve
 'years) may be lengthened to the said term.
 'And I Promise freely of my own accord and
 'Swear that if it so happen that the entire power
 'of disposing of this matter be devolved to me, I
 'will also grant and approve the said term.

'Further, I Prince of *Wales* oblige my self upon
 'my Faith to the Catholick King, that as often
 'as the Illustrious Lady *Infanta* shall require that I
 'should give ear to Divines or others whom her
 'Highness shall be pleased to imploy in matter of
 'the Roman Religion, I will hearken to them
 'willingly

‘willingly without all difficulty, and laying aside
 ‘all excuse. And for further caution in point of
 ‘free exercise of the Catholick Religion and
 ‘Suspension of the Laws above-named, I *Charles*
 ‘Prince of *Wales* Promise and take upon me, in
 ‘the word of a King, that the things above-pro-
 ‘mised and treated concerning those matters shall
 ‘take effect and be put in execution as well in the
 ‘Kingdoms of *Scotland* and *Ireland*, as of *Eng-*
 ‘*land*.

The Privy Councillors Oath, saith the same
 Author, was this.

‘I *A. B.* do Swear that I will truly and fully
 ‘observe as much as belongeth to me all and eve-
 ‘ry the Articles which are contained in the treaty
 ‘of Marriage between the most Gracious *Charles*
 ‘Prince of *Wales* and the most Gracious Lady
 ‘*Donna Maria Infanta* of *Spain*: Likewise I Swear
 ‘that I will neither commit to Execution nor
 ‘Cause to be Executed by my self or any inferior
 ‘Officer serving me, any Laws against any Ro-
 ‘man Catholicks whatsoever, nor will execute a-
 ‘ny punishment inflicted by those Laws, but in all
 ‘things which belong to me will faithfully ob-
 ‘serve, his Majesties word given on that be-
 ‘half.]

I have recited this to shew that the Papists de-
 ceive Forreigners, when they tell them that they
 lived here under cruel Persecution. And yet let
 none think that the King turned Papist: For all
 this was on condition of the Spanish Match which
 was broken: And the King well knew that the
 Parliament would never consent to it.

But his own words may satisfie us in this: For,
 saith *Rushworth*, [‘The King called a Parliament
 F 4 ‘1623.

' 1623. (when the Match was broken.) and faith
 ' to them, [It hath been talked of my remissness
 ' in maintenance of Religion, and suspition of a
 ' Toleration: But as God shall judge me, I never
 ' thought nor meant, nor ever in word expressed
 ' any thing that favoured of it.] But the *stinging*
 Petition against the Papists (as the King called it)
 which this Parliament offered him shewed still
 • what they were against.

If the Papists say these Articles frustrate prove
 no forbearance of Severities against us; *Rush-*
worth answers them saying, pag. 156. of the French
 Match, [' In *Novemb.* the Articles were Sworn
 ' to by King *James*, Prince *Charles*, and the French
 ' King. The Articles concerning Religion were
 ' not much short of those for the Spanish Match.]
 And pag. 173. [' That the English Catholicks
 ' should be no more searched after, nor molested
 ' for their Religion.]

§ 5. And they have the less reason to accuse the
 King of Cruelty, or yet to report that he was in
 Heart a Papist, when he rather endured their dis-
 pleasure than he would turn to them, and yet en-
 dured the disgust both of the Church-men and Par-
 liament than he would lay by his Clemency to-
 ward them. ' The Commons, saith *Rushworth*
 ' pag. 213. *An.* 1625. censured Mr. *Ri. Montague*
 ' for endeavouring to reconcile *England* and *Rome*
 ' and to alienate the Kings Affections from his
 ' well-affected Subjects.

And the A. Bishop *Abbot* wrote this Letter to
 the King.

May it please your Majesty,

‘ I have been too long silent, and am afraid by
 ‘ my silence I have neglected the Duty of the place
 ‘ it hath pleased God to call me to, and your Ma-
 ‘ jesty to place me in. But now I humbly crave
 ‘ leave I may discharge my Conscience toward
 ‘ God, and my Duty to your Majesty : And there-
 ‘ fore I beseech you freely to give me leave to de-
 ‘ liver my self, and then let your Majesty do with
 ‘ me what you please. Your Majesty hath pro-
 ‘ pounded a Toleration of Religion. I beseech
 ‘ you take into consideration what your Act is,
 ‘ what the consequence may be. By your Act you
 ‘ labour to set up the most and Hereti-
 ‘ cal Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, the Whore
 ‘ of *Babylon* : How hateful it will be to God, and
 ‘ grievous to your good Subjects the Professors of
 ‘ the Gospel, that your Majesty who hath often
 ‘ Disputed and Learnedly Written against those
 ‘ Hereticks, should now shew your self a Patron
 ‘ of those wicked Doctrines, which your Pen
 ‘ hath told the World, and your Conscience tells
 ‘ your self, are Superstitious, Idolatrous, and De-
 ‘ testable. And hereunto I add, what you have
 ‘ done in sending the Prince into *Spain*, without
 ‘ the consent of your Council, and Privy and Ap-
 ‘ probation of your People : And though you have
 ‘ a Charge and Interest in the Prince as Son of
 ‘ your Flesh, yet have the people a greater as Son
 ‘ of the Kingdom, upon whom next after your
 ‘ Majesty are their Eyes fixed and their welfare
 ‘ depends. And so tenderly is his going appre-
 ‘ hended, as (believe it) however his return
 ‘ may

' may be safe, yet the Drawers of him into this
 ' Action, so dangerous to himself, so desperate
 ' to the Kingdom, will not pass away unquestion-
 ' ed, unpunished. Besides this Toleration which
 ' you endeavour to set up by your Proclamation,
 ' cannot be done without a Parliament, unless
 ' your Majesty will let your Subjects see that you
 ' will take to your self ability to throw down the
 ' Laws of your Land at your pleasure: What
 ' dreadful consequents these things may draw af-
 ' terward, I beseech your Majesty to consider:
 ' And above all, lest by this Toleration discour-
 ' tenancing the true Profession of the Gospel,
 ' wherewith God hath blessed us, and this King-
 ' dom hath so long flourished under it, your Ma-
 ' jesty do not draw upon this Kingdom in General
 ' and your self in particular Gods heavy wrath
 ' and indignation. Thus in discharge of my Duty
 ' towards God, and your Majesty, and the place
 ' of my Calling, I have taken humble leave to de-
 ' liver my Conscience. Now Sir do what you
 ' please with me.

Thus you see what difficulties the King went
 through to avoid all shew of Cruelty to the Ro-
 man Sect; when at the same time the Canons Ex-
 communicated Protestants that affirmed any thing
 to be unlawful in the Liturgy, Ceremonies, or
 Church Government, and the Laws were in
 force against them.

Chap. IV. *Of the Papists Endeavours in the time of King Charles the First, and the great wrong they did him.*

§. 1. **T**HE same method they still continued,
 1. In vain they subtilly laboured to have perverted the King. 2. And then pretended their great sufferings to procure Indulgence. 3. And secretly gave out that the King was for them, to draw on others that they thought would be still of the Kings Religion.

§ 2. When he was in *Spain* the Bishop of *Couchen* a Trained Veterane, and Head of the Inquisition was chosen to take the charge of labouring his Conversion, and *Carolus Boverius* wrote to him that Book for Church Monarchy, which is now extant: And the Pope wrote to him an insinuating Letter; to which this answer as returned by the Prince is recorded by *Prin* as out of Mr. *De Chesne* the King of *France* his Geographer, and by the *Caballa* of Letters, and by *Rushworth*, who saith the Latine Copy was preserved by some then in *Spain* at the Treaty, and this following in the *Caballa* is but an ill Translation of it.

Most Holy Father,

‘I received the dispatch from your Holiness
 ‘with great content, and with that respect which
 ‘the Piety and Care wherewith your Holiness
 ‘writes doth require. It was an unspeakable
 ‘pleasure to me to read the generous Exploits of
 ‘the Kings my Predecessors, in whose Memory
 ‘Posterity

' Posterity hath not given those Praises and Elo-
 ' gies of Honour as were due to them. I believe
 ' that your Holiness hath set their Examples be-
 ' fore my Eyes to the end I might imitate them in
 ' all my Actions: For in truth they have often
 ' exposed their Estates and Lives for the Exalta-
 ' tion of the Holy Chair. And the Courage
 ' wherewith they have assaulted the Enemies of
 ' the Cross of Jesus Christ, hath not been less
 ' than the Care and Thought which I have to the
 ' End that the Peace and Intelligence which hath
 ' hitherto been wanting in Christendom might be
 ' bound with a true and strong Concord. For as
 ' the common Enemy of Peace still watcheth to
 ' put hatred and dissention among Christian Prin-
 ' ces, so I believe that the Glory of God requires
 ' that we should endeavour to unite them. And
 ' I do not esteem it a greater honour to be de-
 ' scended from so great Princes, than to imitate
 ' them in the Zeal of their Piety. In which it
 ' helps me very much to have known the mind
 ' and will of our thrice honoured Lord and Fa-
 ' ther, and the Holy Intentions of his Catholick
 ' Majesty, to give a happy concurrence to so lauda-
 ' ble a Design. For it grieveth him exceedingly
 ' to see the great evils that grow from the Divi-
 ' sions of Christian Princes, which the Wisdom of
 ' your Holiness foresaw, when it judged the Mar-
 ' riage which you pleased to design between the
 ' Infanta of *Spain* and my self to be necessary to
 ' procure so great a good. For it is very certain
 ' I shall never be so extreemly affectionate to any
 ' thing in the World, as to endeavour alliance
 ' with a Prince that hath the same apprehension
 ' of the true Religion with my self. Therefore I
 ' intreat

intreat your Holiness to believe that I have been
 always very far from Novelties, or to be a par-
 tizan of any Faction, against the Catholick Apo-
 stolick Roman Religion. But on the contrary
 I have sought all occasions to take away the sus-
 picion that might rest upon me. And that I will
 employ my self for the time to come to have
 but one Religion and one Faith; seeing we all
 believe in one Jesus Christ: Having resolved in
 my self, to spare nothing that I have in the
 World, and to suffer all manner of discommo-
 dities, even to the hazarding of my Estate and
 Life for a thing so well pleasing to God: It
 rests only that I thank your Holiness for the per-
 mission you have pleased to afford me. And I
 pray God to give you a Blessed Health, and his
 Glory after so much pains which your Holiness
 takes in his Church. Signed,

Charles Steward.

§ 3. Read *Rushworth's Copy* p. 82, 83. whether
 is most current I know not, but this much shews
 that the Papists complaint of cruel usage here is
 unjust. And lest any believe them that say King
Charles was at the Heart a Papist, let them note,
 1. How many and strong temptations he frustrated.
 2. That when he wrote this he was in their
 power. 3. That here is no promise to subject
 himself to a Foreign Jurisdiction, but to endea-
 vour Peace and Concord; which may better be
 by drawing the Papists to us, than by coming to
 them. The truest Adversaries to Popery are the
 greatest Lovers of true Concord and Peace.

§ 4. All the lenity that was shewed them af-
 ter

ter here, and the agency of *Panzani, Con. &c.* I pass by, lest my recital be misunderstood. The Reader may see enough if not too much in *Rust-worth*; and in *Prin's* Introduction, &c. I only add that this King who was so Zealous for Concord, and that overcame so many Temptations to Popery distant and in his Bosom, and was so firm as not to fear to grant them the audience promised, yet was so much against all cruelty to them, that he suffered very much for his Lenity and Clemency to them, both from themselves and from the Protestants. But the most odious injury that ever they did him, was by pretending his Commission for that most inhumane War and Massacre in *Ireland*; when in time of peace they suddenly Murdered two hundred thousand, and told Men that they had the Kings Commission to rise as for him that was wronged by his Parliament; the very fame of this horrid Murder, and the words of the many Fugitives that escaped in Beggery into *England* (assisted by the Charity of the Dutcheffs of *Ormond* and others) and the English Papists going in to the King was the main cause that filled the Parliaments Armies: I well remember it cast people into such a fear that *England* should be used like *Ireland*, that all over the Countreys, the people oft sate up, and durst not go to Bed, for fear lest the Papists should rise and Murder them. And this is all that the Papists have yet got by their Bloody Cruelty, to necessitate people in fear to take them for their Mortal Foes. Bishop *Morley* saith in his Letter to the Dutcheffs of *York* p. 6, 7. ' That by raising and spreading malicious and scandalous reports against the King that he was a Papist and intended to bring in Popery, on that

'that account only they raised many thousands against
 'him, without whose assistance they could never have o-
 'verpowered him, and oppressed him as they did: And the
 'success they had thereby against the Father, encouraged
 'them to make use of the same Engine against his Son,
 'by giving it out that the King by living so long abroad
 'in Popish Countreys was so corrupted in his Religion,
 'that if he were suffered to return, he would bring in
 'Popery along with him. So that with this groundless
 'fear I found many considerable and very much in-
 'terested Persons possesse when I was sent into England,
 'about two Months before the Kings return; most of
 'which time I spent in undeceiving all I met with, es-
 'pecially the Heads and Leaders of the Presbyterian
 'and Independant Parties, (who seemed to be most
 'afraid of such a Change) by assuring them that those
 'misreports they had heard of the King and his Bro-
 'thers were nothing else but the malicious Inventions
 'of those that were in fact or consent the Murderers of
 'his Father—— For to my certain knowledge (said
 'I) who was almost always an Eye-witness of their
 'actions, the King and both his Brothers, &c.]

And he was confident that this was the case of
 the Dutchess of York, and that the Papists falsely gave
 it out that she was theirs to draw people to them.

And what then could have been more injurious
 to King Charles the First, than this boast and re-
 port of the Irish Murderers. By which they
 would make him to have so dreadfully begun;
 for the rebellion was Octob. 23. 1641. and Edge-
 hill Fight the same day 1642. And hereby they
 have given the Scots occasion to publish to poste-
 rity these Scandalous words in their Books against
 the Cromwellians called, *Truth its Manifest*, prin-
 ted 1645. pag. 17, 19. ['The King seeing he was
 'stopped

‘ stopped by the Scots first in their own Countrey, next
 ‘ in England, to carry on his great design takes the
 ‘ Irish Papists by the hand rather than be alway dis-
 ‘ appointed, and they willingly undertake to levy Arms
 ‘ for his Service, that is, for the Romish Cause, the
 ‘ Kings design being subservient to the Roman Cause,
 ‘ though he abused thinks otherwise, and believes that
 ‘ Rome serveth to his purpose : But to begin the work
 ‘ they must make sure of all the Protestants, if they
 ‘ cannot otherwise by Murdering and Massacring
 ‘ them — p. 19. The next recourse was to the I-
 ‘ rish Papists, his good Friends, to whom from Scot-
 ‘ land a Commission is dispatched under the Great Seal
 ‘ (which Seal was at that instant time in the Kings
 ‘ own Custody) of that Kingdom to hasten according
 ‘ to former agreement, the raising of the Irish in Arms
 ‘ who no sooner receive this new Order but they break
 ‘ out, &c.] And I am not willing to believe this.

A report so dishonourable to the King, his Life,
 his Arms, his Death, and to all that fought for
 him, that the Fifth Commandment forbids us to
 believe it, though the Scots should say, They
 saw the Sealed Commissions: Yea though I had
 seen them my self; seeing it is possible for the
 Irish to Counterfeit the Scots Broad Seal.

But by this it appeareth what wrong the King
 had by the Irish boasting of his Commission, and
 the Papists pretending to more countenance than
 he gave them.

§ 4. And as the said R. Bishop of Winchester was
 confident they slandered the Dutches of York in her
 Life, so he conjectureth that the Jesuit Maimbrough
 hath done since her death, and that some of them
 devised the Confession which he printeth as hers,
 which he professeth to be false as to the accusation
 of himself. The words of Maimbrough translated
 are these.

A Declaration of the Dutcheſs of York, translated out of *Maimbourg's Histoire du Calvinisme*.

A Person Educated in the Church of England, and as much instructed in her Doctrine (according to the Opinion of the most able Divines of her Party) as her Condition and Capacity could admit, ought to expect to be the Object of publick censure, when she quits her Religion to embrace that of the Church of Rome. And as I freely confess that I have been one of her greatest Enemies, if not in effect at least in will, I have thought it reasonable, that for the satisfaction of my Friends, I should declare the Motives and Reasons of my Conversion, and of the so suddain and unexpected change of my Religion, yet without engaging my self in the Questions and Objections which might be made on this Occasion.

I Protest in the presence of Almighty God, that since my return into England, no Person whatsoever, hath directly or indirectly, perswaded me to embrace the Catholick Religion: It is a favour which I owe to the alone Mercy of God; I dare not even think that the Prayers which I have made him every day since my return from France and Flanders, to beg of him to discover to me the Truth have obtained for me.

It is very true, that having seen the Ferboure and the Devotion of the Catholicks of those Countries, and feeling that I had none of it, or very little, I have never ceased since that time to ask of God the Grace, that if I were not of the true Religion, I might be so before I died.

Nevertheless I had not the least doubt but that the Belief of the Church of England was the true, and I never had any scruple or trouble of Conscience on this Occasion until November last, that I began to read Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation, which is much esteemed; and where of the reading in the Opinion of all the able Men of the Kingdom, is sufficient to free the Conscience from all Scruples and Doubts which might arise about Religion. But for my part far from finding in that History what was said of it, I found to the contrary that by reading of it; it only made me see the most horrible Sacriledges that were ever heard spoken of, and that it was not sufficient to satisfy an indifferent understanding, nor to persuade it that we had the least foundation or appearance of reason for changing the ancient Face of the Church, and renouncing the Catholick Religion.

I noted in that History first, that Henry the Eighth quitted not the Communion of the Church of Rome, nor opposed the Authority of the Pope; but because he would not let him put away the Queen his Wife, to marry another. 2. That King Edward the Sixth being yet a Child, his Uncle who governed him abusing the Royal Authority, which he had in his hand, enriched himself by appropriating to himself and his Family the Lands and Goods of the Church. 3. That Queen Elizabeth not being the lawful Heir of the Crown, could not keep the unjust Possession which she had taken but by renouncing the true Church, because the Purity and Rectitude of her Doctrine was not consistent with the Usurpation of the Kingdom of Great Britain.

I could not conceive, much less believe, that the Holy Spirit which governs the true Church, should be the Author of the Three Points that I now noted, which have been the only Foundation of the Subversion of the ancient Religion, to favour the Licentiousness of Henry the Eighth, the Usurpation of Queen Elizabeth, and the Ambition mixed with the extreme Avarice of the Uncle of Edward the Sixth. Neither could I understand how the Bishops, who boast that they had no other design in separating themselves from the Communion of the Church of Rome, but to endeavour the re-establishing of the Doctrine & Discipline of the Primitive Church, have not thought of this pretended Reformation, but while Henry the Eighth attempted a Separation from the Roman Church, that he might satisfy his guilty Pleasures.

All these Reflections having busied my Mind after the reading of that History, I endeavoured to instruct my self in the Points controverted between us and the Catholics: I examined them the most exactly that I could by the Scripture it self, and though I thought not my self sufficient for understanding it well, I found nevertheless some things which appeared to me so clear, so easie to be understood, that I have a thousand times wondered that I have been so long without reflecting on them.

I was particularly and strongly convinced of the real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, of the Infallibility of the Church, Confession, and Prayer for the Dead. I was willing to confer of these Matters by way of Discourse with the two most able Bishops that we have in England, and both confessed to me ingenu-

ously, that there are many things in the Church of Rome which it was to be wished that the Church of England had still observed, as Confession, which it could not be denied but that God had commanded it, and Prayer for the Dead, which is one of the most authentick and ancient Practices of the Christian Religion; But as to themselves, they made use thereof in private, without making publick profession thereof.

As I pressed one of these Bishops upon the other Points of Controversie, and principally on the real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, he answered me freely; That were he a Catholick, he would not change Religion, but that having been educated in a Church in which he believed there was all that was necessary to Salvation, and there having received his Baptism, he thought he could not quit it without great Scandal.

All this Discourse served but to increase the ardent desire which I had to become a Catholick, and I felt inward pains and horrible disquiets after the Conversation I had with these two Bishops.

Nevertheless that I might not precipitate in an Affair of this Importance, and where my Salvation was concerned, I endeavoured to satisfy myself entirely. I prayed God with all my heart to calm my troubled Mind by making me to know the Truth, the search of which had caused my trouble. Being in this Condition, I went at Christmas to the Kings Chapel to receive the Sacrament, which put my Soul into new troubles, which continued till I discovered my state of Mind to a Catholick, who to procure me the repose and tranquill-

lity which I wished, caused a good Priest to come to me, and he was the first Ecclesiastick, with whom I conferred of my inward condition and the affairs of my Soul. The more I spoke with him, the more I found my self inwardly perswaded and strengthened by the Grace of the Holy Spirit to change Religion.

As I could not doubt of the truth of the words of Jesus Christ, which assures us that the Holy Sacrament contains his flesh and his Blood; I could not easily believe that he who is truth it self, had permitted that the Communion under one kind had been introduced into his Church, in which and with which he hath promised to dwell to the end of the World, if it sufficeth not for the Salvation of them who communicate under one kind only.

To conclude, I am not able to enter into Dispute with any on these great Truths, and though I were, I would not engage my self further than in a Discourse of a few words, and without contesting to express simply the Motives and Reasons of my Conversion.

I call God to witness, who knows the secret of Mens hearts, that I had never thought of changing Religion if I had believed I might obtain Salvation by continuing in the state I was by my Birth and Education, and I think it is not necessary that I here declare that it was not Interest, nor prospect of Honors, or of any fading and perishable Profits which have perswaded me thereunto, seeing that on the contrary by changing Religion, I exposed my self to the hazard of losing both my Friends and my Credit; and freely to confess the truth, I considered and examined often, whether it was not more expedient for me to keep my Friends,

my Rank, and my Credit in the Court, by continuing in the Exercise of the Religion of the Church of England, than quit all these things in a view and hope of the good things of the life to come; but thorough the Mercy of God, which enlightens those that seek it, I felt no pain or difficulty in making the choice I have. I shall only say that all my fear hath been, lest the poor Catholics of this Countrey should suffer much on the occasion of my Conversion, and that God should not give me the Grace to suffice patiently with them the Disgraces and Afflictions of this Life to merit the Eternal. At *St. James* the 8th of *August*, 1670.

Postscript.

BUT since the first writing of this, the Publick Matter of Fact hath taught the World how little Cause those that he calleth the Heads of the Presbyterians and Independants, or any others, had to believe Bishop *Morley's* confident Testimony, of one or other; Or honest Mr. *Gache's* Letter to me, or the rest of the French Letters published with it by *Lauderdale*. I cannot forget Dr. *Morley's* words to my self in *Jan. 1659*. before King *Charles II.* came in, that most on this side the *Alpes* would joyn with the Church of *England*, were it not for the blocks that *Calvin* had laid in the way; And this he knew by his converse with them. But this Coalition was not to be our becoming Papists, (*quoad nomen*) but *France* forsooth, if not *Flanders* too, would turn Protestants (as they have done.)

I knew not when I writ this Book, 1. Of King *James's* Paper published as found in King *Charles* the

the Second's Pocket, and the Testimonies that he died a Papist, nor what was witnessed of his Engagement for them. 2. I knew not of what King *James* the Second would after be and do. 3. I knew not of Archbishop *Bramhall's* Letter, Printed by Dr. *Parre* in Archbishop *Usher's* Life, confidently assuring Archbishop *Usher*, that on his certain Information, the Papists in 1647. got into *Cromwell's* Army, and confederated with the Papists at *Oxford* in the King's Army to have the King put to Death: And whether they sent beyond Sea for Approbation, and obtained it.

Chap. V. *The foreign Leaders of the English Conciliators, who are for introducing a foreign Jurisdiction.*

§. 1. **T**He horrid Confusions in the Roman Church by two and three Popes at once (some Kingdoms cleaving to one, and some to another) constrained the Emperor and divers Princes to call a Council called **General**, for remedy. The Popes being by this Council condemned and deposed, it could not be expected that they should approve them and consent: so that the Council was necessitated (though cross to late Custom) to declare their Power to be above the Popes, so far as to judge and depose him if he deserve it: This way went the Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance*, and *Basil*. But the Pope's Upholders still stuck to him, and said, Parliaments may as well depose Kings. The Body cannot cut off the Head. And *Engenius* 4th, though con-

demned by the Council and deposed as a Heretic, Simonist, Blasphemer, &c. kept Possession, and their Church succeedeth him to this day.

§. 2. This opinion for the Church Diffusive represented in a Council being above the Pope, was kept alive in *Bohemia, France* and other Countries, and in *Luther's* time did much further his Reformation; by encouraging Princes and People to disobey the Pope. And *Luther* at the first seemed to go but little further: But afterward quite cast off the Pope, and denied all his Claim of universal or foreign Jurisdiction.

§. 3. Some that joyned with *Luther* in reforming many Abuses, thought that the whole World (or Church) must have one Humane Head or Governor in Religion, and that we must not separate from subjection to the Pope, but only keep him to govern by Church Canons, and not Arbitrarily, as being *singulis major*, but *universis minor*. And so the Controversie came to be the same as between Monarchs that will be above Law, and those that are limited by the Laws. The Italians and some others are for the first; but the French and some others are only for his limited Power. Of these in *Luther's* time were *Erasmus, Julius Pflug, Sidonius, Agricola*, the Authors of the Interim, and *Wicelius, Cassander, Hassmeisier*, and after *Fr. Baldwin*, and divers others. And in *France* some excellent Lawyers, yet more moderate, as the Chancellor *Mich. Hospitalius, Thuanus*, and a great Party with them.

§. 4. *Joh. Gerson* Chancellor, and a Member of the Council of *Constance* before these, was so moderate (though he was for burning *Hus* and *Jerome of Prague*) that in the great Point of the suffi-

sufficiency of God's own Laws, he condemneth even most of these Moderators. I will insert his words in *Sermone in die Circumcisionis Domini habito Trascena coram Papa* (in the Pope's own hearing.)

[*Schismatis presentis sedationem invenire non sufficient leges humana jam condita, nisi superior Lex Divina viva & architectonica consulatur. Quod forte non satis actum est usq; in presentis: Obliget quod ait Dominus in Isaia, Timuerunt me mandato hominum, & doctrinis; ideo ecce ego addam ut admirationem faciam populo huic miraculo grandi & stupendo; Peribit enim sapientia à sapientibus ejus, & intellectus prudentium ejus abscondetur: Ex quo loco sumpsit Jesus illud improprium contra Phariseos quod irritum faciebant mandatum Dei propter suas traditiones. Audirent utinam ista auribus suis hi qui legem Evangelicam, legem Divinam cum professoribus suis deserentes, humanis traditionibus incumbant toti, adeo ut ad superiorem legem illam oculos attollere vel non valeant ex ruditate, vel nolint ex iniquitate, vel negligant ex inerti segnitie, cum tamen rebus leges humana non sufficiunt; prout in schismate presente compertum videtur; & ad Legis divine radicem & interpretationem Consultatio referatur, & secundum eam conscientia formetur necesse est, Quid autem mali, quid periculi, quid Confusionis attulerit contemptus sacre Scripturæ; utiq; SUFFICIENTIS PRO REGIMINE ecclesiæ Alioquin Christus fuisset Legislator imperfectus: Interrogetur experientia, consideretur clerus, cui desponsari debuerat Sapientia quæ de sursum est, purifica & pudica; an ipse fornicatus est cum adultera illa meretricula, sapientia terrena, animali, diabolica: Status insuper ecclesiæ nonne factus est totus brutalis & monstruosus?*]

'strosus? ubi cælum deorsum, hoc est, id quod spiri-
 'tuale est, & terra sursum, spiritus serviens & car-
 'dominans: Principale accessorium, & accessorium
 'principale; usq; ad hoc ut quidam delirare non dubi-
 'tent quod per inventiones humanas etiam melius, quàm
 'per legem divinam & Evangelicam regeretur: Quasi
 'minus sit anima quàm Corpus, & spiritualis quàm
 'carnalis fructus: Hac assertio per meam fidem blas-
 'phemia est; nedum falsa. Evangelica quippe doctrina
 'per suos professores dilatavit Ecclesiam usq; in Cæ-
 'lum, quàm filii Agur exquirentes sapientiam quæ de
 'terra est detruserunt usq; in cœnum: Et quod ex toto
 'non corruerit est ex gratia Dei & salvatoris nostri.
 'Hac ego loquor eo liberius quia mihi Conscius sum,
 'non ex questu, non ambitu, non ad laudem propriam
 'mea professionis, sed pro assertionem veritatis & utili-
 'tate publica hac dicere.

O happy England, if Protestants had been as much in this against Popery and Error.

§. 5. And here the Roman Deceivers and some peaceable Men of them, have joyned to draw us to them on Pretences of Peace and Reconciliation. Some honest peaceable Men have been destroyed by the rest for their Moderation. The Learnedst Moderator that we have had, was *M. Ant. de dominis* Archbishop of Spalato, whose Books de *Republ. Eccles.* are full of both Learning and Judgment, and so moderate that I cannot call him a Papist: Though being enticed to Rome again by flattery, he perished by their Cruelty.

What Leander was, I am not fully acquainted. *Fr. de Sancta Clara* alias Davenport, was a real Papist, and designed on the pretence of Reconciliation to draw us over to them; And hath shewed more acquaintance with *Scotus* and other School-

Schoolmen, than with the Protestants in his attempt to reconcile our Articles to their Doctrine.

Dr. Morley Bishop of Winchester tells us, That in his Conference with the Jesuit F. Darcy, he would have drawn him to them, by perswading him that they are not unreconcilable but can abate us many things; P. 5. [*The Father replied, that perhaps we should not find them so stiff in all Points: for in things of Positive and Ecclesiastical Constitution only, the Church might in order to Christian Peace alter something which she had before Established; and he doubted not but she would: And his Instances were, the Latine Service, the Sacrament under one Species, and the Calibate of Priests; But as for Matters of Faith, they could not alter or abate any thing, instancing in the Point of the Churches Infallibility.*]

And this is their ordinary Opinion, and yet they would not grant the Cup to the *Bohemians*, and to this day the Churches Peace hath not prevailed with them for such Alterations as they say are in their Power.

What of this Kind they offered in the Treaty with Archbishop *Laud* we shall see after.

The Book called *The Catholick Moderator*, goeth this way.

But no man hath attempted it with so much ability of Judgment and Success of late as *Hugo Grotius*, in his *Votum Pro Pace*, *Consultatio* and *Notes on Cassander*, his Annotations on the Revelations, and *De Antichristo*, and his Writings against *Rivet*. The Dutch dealt hardly with him as an Arminian, and Judged him to perpetual Imprisonment, (when they had not such another Man among

among them) from which his Wife delivered him, getting him carried out in a Trunk, on pretence of carrying from him his Arminian Books. And being escaped into *France* he was intimate with the Learned Jesuits, especially *Petravius*, and made the Queen of *Sweden's* Ambassador, who shortly after turned Papist, and is yet living at *Rome*: And it is no censoriousness to suspect that his great exasperation might have influence on his judgment.

And because he is the Man whom our English Defenders of a foreign Jurisdiction own, I will next tell you what his late judgment was in his own words.

I confess I have a far greater honour for those Men that were bred in Popery and are Moderators, than for those being bred Protestants revolt from Reformation to a Coalition. I doubt not but *Gerson*, was a very holy Man: *Cassander* seemeth to have been an excellent Pious learned Man: And I doubt whether most of our nominal Protestants that are for a foreign Jurisdiction be near so moderate as he. He oft (as *de Officio Pii Viri*, p. 788, 789, &c) maketh the Church of *Rome* to be but a part of the Universal Church: He maintaineth (' that some called Schismatics, are not ' indeed departed from the Church for departing ' from *Rome*, as long as they depart not from Christ ' the Head of the Church: and that only defe- ' ction of Love, and not diversity of Rites and ' Opinions cuts Men off from Christ! And that ' as long as they are joyned to Christ the Head by ' sound belief of him, and by the Bond of Cha- ' rity and Peace, they are joyned to the Church. ' and are not to be taken for Schismatics and
: Aliens

‘ Aliens from the Church, though they be rejected
 ‘ and seem separated from their Society and Com-
 ‘ munion, by another more powerful part of the
 ‘ Church, which doth obtain the Government.
 (How much more moderate and sound is *Cassan-*
der, than such as *Mr. Dodwell*.) And *Pag. 791*.
 he saith the same of the Oriental Churches, and
 the Ethiopians that are not under the Pope. And
 he still speaketh so cautelously, that it is not easie
 to understand how far he took the Papacy to be
 necessary. Yet sometime he only excuseth the
 unwilling departers from *Rome*, and asserteth,
Consult. de Pont. Rom. p. 931. ‘ That it is not alien
 ‘ from the consent of the ancient Church, that
 ‘ Obedience to our Chief or Supream Rector the
 ‘ Successor of *St. Peter* in Governing and Feeding
 ‘ the Church, is required to the Unity of this
 ‘ external Church: And it is not only Primacy of
 ‘ Order, but Obedience to one Chief Ruler that
 he Pleads for. And in his Epistle to *Lindanus*,
 and frequently he still professeth only to desire
 some Reformation in the Roman Church, but
 never to depart from it, nor own those that do.

Chap. VI. *Grotius's Judgment in his own Words.*

§. I. **T**O give you *Grotius's* Judgment to the full,
 would be to transcribe many Books:
 I shall choose some plain Passages.

Discussione Apologet. Rivet. p. 255. ‘ Those that
 ‘ knew *Grotius*, knew that he always wished for
 ‘ the restitution of Christians into one and the same
 ‘ Body.

(a) So they are : even of
that one Body of which
Christ is Head.

Body. (a) But he some-
time thought even after
he was known to the
most excellent *Vairius*, that it might be begun
by a Conjunction of the Protestants among them-
selves : Afterwards he saw that this was altoge-
ther unfeasible ; because, besides that the Genius
of almost all the Calvinists is most alien from
all Peace, the Protestants are not joyned among

(b) They are united in
all the 7 terms of Unity
required, *Eph.* 4. 4, 5, 6.
They desire not to be of
any Universal Body but
Christ's, no more than un-
der one Monarch of the
World.

themselves by any com-
mon Government of the
Church, (b) which are
the Causes that the Par-
ties made cannot be ga-
thered into one Body of
Protestants, yea and that
more and more Parties
are ready to rise out of them. Wherefore *Gro-
tius* now absolutely judgeth, and many with him,
that the Protestants cannot be joyned among
themselves unless at once they be joyned to them
that cohere to the See of *Rome*, without which

(c) Nor in Kingdoms
neither under one Man or
Senate ; But they have a
better Union.

there can be no common
Government hoped for
in the Church. (c) There-
fore he wisheth that the
Division which fell out,
and the Causes of that Division were taken away.
The Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome* according to
the Canons, is none of these, &c.

Ib. P. 185. *Grotius* professeth that he will so
interpret Scripture, God favouring him, and Pious
Men being consulted, that he crosses not the Rule
delivered by himself, and by the Council of
Trent, &c.

' P. 239. The Augustane Confession commodi-
 'ciously explained hath scarce any thing which may
 'not be reconciled with those Opinions which are
 'received with the Catholicks by Authority of
 'Antiquity and of Synods as may be known out of
 'Cassander and Hoffmeister. And there are among
 'the Jesuits also that think not otherwise.

' P. 71. (The Churches that join with Rome
 'have not only the Scriptures, but the Opinions
 'explained in the Councils, and the Popes decree
 'against Pelagius, &c. They have also received
 'the egregious Constitutions of Councils and Fa-
 'thers, in which there is abundantly enough for
 'the Correction of Vices : But all use them not
 'as they ought : And this is it that all the Lovers
 'of Piety and Peace would have corrected (as
 'Borromaus did.)

Page 18. Speaking of false Doctrine, [' These
 'are the things which, thanks be to God, the
 'Catholicks do not thus believe, though many
 'that call themselves Catholicks so live as if they
 'did believe them. But Protestants (so live)
 '(by force of their Opinions, and Catholicks by
 'the decay of Discipline.

Page 95. ' What was long ago the judgment of
 'the Church of Rome, the Mistress of others, we
 'may best know by the Epistles of the Roman
 'Bishops to the Africans and French, to which
 'Grotius will subscribe with a willing mind.

Page 7. ' They accuse the Bull of Pius Quintus,
 'that it hath Articles besides those of the Creed ;
 'but the Synod of Dort hath more. — But
 'these in the Bull are New as Dr. River will have
 'it. But very many Learned Men think other-
 'wise, that they are not new, if they be rightly
 'under-

understood, and that this appeareth by the places
 both of Holy Scripture, and of such as have
 ever been of great Authority in the Church,
 which are cited in the Margin of the Canons of
Trent.

Page 35. And this is it which the Synod of
Trent saith, That in that Sacrament Jesus Christ
 true God and truly Man, is really and substan-
 tially contained under the form of those sensible
 things: Yet not according to the Natural man-
 ner of existing, but Sacramentally, and by that
 way of existing, which though we cannot ex-
 press in words, yet may we by Cogitation illu-
 strated by Faith be certain that to God it is pos-
 sible. (The Councils expressions are, that
 [*There is made a change of the whole substance of*
the Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance
of Wine into the Blood; Which Conversion the Ca-
tholick calleth Transubstantiation.

Page 79. When the Synod of *Trent* saith,
 That the Sacrament is to be adored with Di-
 vine Worship it, intends no more, but that
 the Son of God himself is to be adored.

Page 14. *Grotius* distinguisheth between the
 Opinions of School men, which oblige no Man,
 (for saith *Melchior Canus* our Church alloweth
 us great liberty) and therefore could give no
 just cause of departing (as the Protestants did)
 and between those things that are defined by
 Councils.

Even by that of *Trent*: The Acts of which if
 any Man read with a mind propense to peace, he
 will find that they may be explained fitly and a-
 greeably to the places of Holy Scripture and of
 the ancient Doctors that are put in the Margin.
 And

And if besides this by the care of Bishops and Kings those things be taken away which contradict that holy Doctrine, and were brought in by evil Manners, and not by Authority of Councils or old Tradition, then *Grotius* and many more with him will have that with which they may be content.]

Val. pro pace, That which he blameth is. 1. The School-mens liberty of disputing, and Opinions not agreeable to Councils. 2. And the Pride, Covetousness, and ill Lives of the Prelates and others (which all sober Jesuits and Papists blame.)

Page 16. That the labours of *Grotius* for the peace of the Church were not displeasing to many equal Men, many know at *Paris*, and many in all *France*, many in *Poland*, and *Germany*, and not a few in *England*, that are placid, and Lovers of peace: For as for the now-raging Brownists and others like them, with whom *Dr. Rivet* better agreeth than with the Bishops of *England*, who can desire to please them that is not touched with their Venom ?]

And whereas you may find *Grotius* and his Adherents yet disclaiming Popery, and saying, 'They are no Papists, he tells you his meaning, *Ib*, p. 15. [In that Epistle *Grotius* by Papists meant those that without any difference do approve of all the sayings and doings of the Pope, for Honour and Lucre's sake as is usual.]

By this description I suppose that many Popes even of late were no Papists, such as condemned the Acts and Persons of their Predecessors, and such as censured *Liberius* and *Honorius*, nor *Adrian* the sixth, that saith a Pope may be a Heretick;

nor *Baronius*, *Binnius*, *Genebrard*, that exclaim against many of them : Nor *Bellarmino*, nor *Queen Mary*, nor *More* or *Fisher*, nor *Bonner*, nor *Gardner*, nor any that ever I met with.

But others more moderately call only those Papists that are for the Popes Power above Councils : And so the French are none ; nor the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* were none : *Grotius* addeth p. 45. that ' By Papists he doth not mean them ' that saving the Rights of Kings and Bishops do ' give to the Pope or Bishop of *Rome* that Primacy ' which ancient Customs and Canons, and the E- ' dicta of ancient Emperors and Kings assign them ; ' which Primacy is not so much the Bishops, as the ' Roman Churches preferred before all other by ' common consent. So *Liberius* the Bishop being ' so lapsed that he was dead to the Church, the ' Church of *Rome* retained its right and defended ' the Cause of the Universal Church.]

Ans. If it be a Primacy of Name and Honour only without any Governing Power, it's nothing to our case. But seeing it's a Governing Primacy that he means, 1. It's against the right of Kings and Kingdoms, that Foreigners claim Jurisdiction over them. 2. Emperors never gave Popes or Councils power over other Princes Dominions, nor could give any such. 3. Nor did ancient Councils, nor could do. Who gave it them ? And who knows to what Councils he will limit this power ? Councils these thousand years have been for much of Popery. 4. If Common Consent give this power, it binds not the Dissenters.

The Judgment of others concerning *Grotius*.

1. *Vincentius* wrote a Book called *Grotius Papizans*.

2. *Claudio*

2. *Claud. Saravius* an Eminent Parliament-man in Paris in his Epistles, p. 52, 53. ad Gron. saith, 'Hæri inuisti Legatum' — De ejus libro & libello postremis interrogatus respondet plane Mileterio consona: Romanam fidem esse veram & sinceram, solusq; clericorum mores degeneres schismati dedisse locum. Adferebatq; plura in hanc sententiam. Quid dicam? Merito quod falso olim Paulo Festus, [τὴ πολλὰ οὐ γεγυμνασθῆναι ἐν ματαίᾳ, &c.] Sed hac tibi soli. Insensissimus est Riveto. Est sanè in præcipiti in quo diu stare non licet. Deploro veris lacrymis tantam jacturam: Deumq; ex animo supplex veneror ut illi spiritum suum mentemq; meliorem det.

And in another Epistle to *Salmasius* p. 196. he saith, being ask'd his Judgment of his last Books, 'Tantum abest ut omnia probem, ut vix aliquid in eo reperiocui sine conditione calculum apponam meum. Verissimè dixit ille qui dixit Grotium papizare. Vix tamen in isto scripto aliquid legi quod mirarer, quodve ἀπεροσέβητος occurreret. Nunquid enim omnes istiusmodi authoris lucubrationes erga Papistarum errores perpetuam συντάξαν & χρυσὴν erga Jesuitas amorem, erga nos plusquam varinianum odium prodant & clamant. In voto quod ejus nomen præferebat an veritus est hæc παραστῆναι profiteri?

And how far he was familiar with Grotius he tells us p. 248. 'Ad Vincent. Fabrit. [Cum eo nempe Communicaveram vel solebam mea fere omnia,] &c.

And what *Salmasius* thought of him these words of *Saravius* ad *Salmas.* intimate.

'Ex quo à vera orbita in religionis negotio deflexit, captasti occasionem toto biennio antequam fato fungeretur, cum illudendi, certe irritandi.

I have formerly said that worthy Mr. *Eresham* yet living, (since dead) told me that *Petavius* told him that *Grotius* was resolved to have declared himself for the Church of *Rome*, and joyed with them if he had returned safe from the Journey he died in.

Henr. Valesius in his Funeral Oration on *Petavius* faith, p. 684. *Batesii Collect.* [*Quid non præsidiis clarissimum Virum Hugonem Grotium ad Catholicam Communionem adduceret? Erat ille quidem minime nobis alienus, & pæne noster, quippe qui doctrinam Tridentini Concilii in omnibus sese amplecti palam profiteretur. Id unum supererat, ut Ecclesia Sacramentariam ingressus Communionem nostram Sociaretur. Quod ille nescio quas ob causas dum ad Catholicam fidem unitatem plurimos secum sperat adducere Consulto differebat.*

But I make no other mens, but his own words the Index of his Faith.

Chap. VII. Of the several sorts of Conciliators or Peace-makers about our Controversies with the Papists.

§ 1. **I**F any shall think that I who have spent so much time and labour for the Churches peace, am now against it, or would raise dishonourable suspicions, on any just endeavours to that end, they will utterly mistake me.

There are divers sorts of Endeavours for peace with the Papists, by real Protestants.

§ 2. I. The old Conformists that prevailed against the Dissenters in Queen Elizabeth's days were

were for going no further from the Papists than they needs must, lest they gave them occasion of accusation.

II. Since then many Men have taken notice that many of our Doctrinal Controversies consist more in ambiguous words, and misunderstanding of each other than most on either side imagine: And they have endeavoured the lessening of such Controversies by better Explications and stating of the Case: In this kind *Spalatensis* and Bishop *W. Forbes* have done very Learnedly, but in some things yielded a great deal too far. *Camero*, *Amiraldus*, *Capellus*, *Testardus*, the *Theses Salmurienfes* and *Sedanenses* have done much: But no Man so much as *Lude Le Blank* in his *Theses*, which he sent me his desire here to publish. To these I adjoin my self, as (among many other Writings) in my *Catholick Theology* and *Methodus Theologiae* I have openly and largely shewed the World. And no Censures have deterred me from this honest and necessary way of pacification.

III. But there are others that would on pretence of Peace take in many of their Errors in Doctrine, Government and Worship; But yet are for no Foreign Jurisdiction.

IV. But those that I now write against go further, and some under the Name of a Prince, Patriarch, and the *Principium Unitatis Catholicae* would come under the Pope, some by pretence of the power of General Councils, or an Universal Colledge of all Bishops, and some by these and Patriarchs conjunct, would bring us under a Foreign Jurisdiction, and contrive an Union on some French terms. And would to this end let in abundance of corruptions in Discipline and Worship

ship on pretence of Obedience to the Canons of Councils. Yea some condemn those as Schismatics, yea as in a state of Damnation who are not in these matters of their mind. It is these that I am against.

§ 3. While I oppose these, I still own my fore-said reconciling Books, and no reproach of those that run into a contrary extream shall ever drive me from the true terms of Peace, nor to desire any cruelty against them, or any of their Sufferings but what necessary defence (of Soul and Body) require: And though my Exposition of the *Revelation* have offended many, upon far closer study of it since, I am not less but more perswaded that Pagan Rome was *Babylon*, and that *John Fox* (*Martyrol. Vol. I. p. III.* who took his Oath of a Divine Revelation to him, which brought him to take the Pagan Empire for the Beast with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, and to expound the Times and Thousand years accordingly) is much to be regarded: But if I be uncertain of such points, I will rather suspend my Judgment, than in uncertainty venture on any thing that is against Christian Love and Peace. I hold Communion with the Romans in Christianity, though not in Popery: I take all true Christians among them for Part of the Catholick Church of Christ, though I take their pretended Catholick Church as Headed by the Pope, for no Church of Christ at all, nor as Headed by any Usurping Humane Head whatsoever.

Chap. VIII. *The Doctrine of Archbishop Bromhall* [*in defence of Grotius in his Book called, His Vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, as managed by Mr. Baxter in his Treatise of the Grotian Religion, I* fiercely Prefaced by a Dignitary of the Church. (Parker.)

§ 1. I mean to give you his own words, and pass by his mistakes against my self. Only saying, That it was not fairly done to affirm that I numbered him with the Papists, or those that designed to bring in Popery, when I had no such words, yea and praising him, excepted him from that number, only dissenting from his too near approach : But whether he except himself, his words will best shew.

§ 2. Page 20, 21. he saith, [' I will endeavour to give some light what was the Religion of *Grotius* : He was in affection a Friend and in desire a true Son of the Church of *England* : And on his Death bed recommended that Church as it was Legally Established to his Wife, and such other of his Family as were then about him, obliging them by his Authority to adhere firmly to it so far as they had opportunity. (a)

(a) They that Record his death say that he died in *Rostok* in his too hasty passage from *Sweden* towards his Wife then absent; *Quistorpius* Pastor of *Rostok* being with him: Yet this Bishop knew *Grotius*: Who saith true I know not.

(b) How much that is
see in their Patriarch *Je-*
remias, and in the Council
at *Florence*.

(c) The very worst of
Popery was brought in by
Hildebrand long before four
hundred years last : And
he that can receive all that
their Councils brought in
till 1256. need not stick at
any of the rest save Tran-
substantiation : We cannot
obey the Pope as Patriarch
and Universal Primate ,
though he would quit the
last four hundred years
additions : Nor think this
a quitting Popery.

Page 81. [' I know no
' Member of the Greek
' Church that give them
' (the Popes) either more
' or less than I do. (b)

Page 82. ' To wave
' their last four hundred
' years determinations is
' implicately to renounce
' all the necessary Causes
' of this great Schism.
' And to rest satisfied with
' their old Patriarchal
' Power and Dignity, and
' Primacy of Order (which
' is another part of my
' Proposition , is to quit
' the Modern Papacy both
' Name and Thing. (c)

Page 84. ' In the first place if the Bishop of
' *Rome* were reduced from his Universality of So-
' vereign Jurisdiction *Jure Divino*, to his *Principium*
' *Unitatis*, and his Court regulated by the Canons
' of the Fathers, which was the sence of the Coun-
' cils of *Constance* and *Basil*, and is desired by ma-
' ny Roman Catholicks as well as we. 2. If
' the Creed or necessary Points of Faith were re-
' duced to what they were in the time of the four
' first Oecumenical Councils according to the De-

(d) Did the third tye us
to the fourth?
' cree of the third General
' Council, (d) admitting
' no additional Articles but
' only necessary Explications, and those to be
' made by the Authority of a General Council,
' or

or one so General as can be Convocated.

(e) And lastly, Suppo-

sing that some things from

whence offence hath been

either given or taken—

(e) That was well put in. But by whom Convocated?

I say in case these three things were accorded—

whether Christians might not live in an Holy

Communion, and come in the same publick Wor-

ship of God, free from all Schismatical Separ-

ation of themselves one from another, &c.

We have no Controversie with the Church of

Rome about a Primacy of Order, but a Supre-

macy of Power. (f) I

shall declare my sence in

(f) Over Councils.

four Conclusions. 1. That

St. Peter had a fixed Chair at Antioch, and after

at Rome is a truth which no Man who giveth any

credit to the Ancient Fathers and Councils can

either deny or well doubt of.

2. That St. Peter had a Primacy of Order a-

mong the Apostles is the unanimous voice, &c.

3. Some Fathers and School-men who were no

Sworn Vassals to the Roman Bishops affirm that

this Primacy of Order is affixed to the Chair of

St. Peters Successors for ever, &c.

Page 107. They who made the Bishop of Rome

a Patriarch were the Primitive Fathers, not ex-

cluding the Apostles and Christian Emperors

and Oecumenical Councils: What Laws they

made in this case we are bound to obey for

Conscience sake (till they

be repealed lawfully) by

virtue of the Law of

Christ. (g)

(g) Did Christ make the Subjects of the Roman Emperors perpetual Law-makers to other Princes and

all the World? Or to that Empire when it's dissolved?

Page

Page 104. (' To my Objection that all Protestants must then pass for Schismatics that take not the Pope for *Principium Unitatis* and Patriarch, &c. he answereth [still weaker and weaker : — Must a Man quit his just right because some dislike it? Their dislike is scandal taken; but the quitting of that which is right for their satisfaction should be the scandal given: Whether is the worse? 1. How are they forced to fall under the reproach of Schismatics? If they be forced any way, it is by their own wilful Humours or erroneous Conscience: Others force them not. 2. I would have him consider which is worse and the more dangerous condition, for Christians to fall under the reproach of Schismatics — or to fall into Schism it self. Whoever shall oppose the just Power of a Lawful Patriarch lawfully proceeding is a material Schismatick.]

Reader, I forbear confuting these things by the way, being now but on the Historical relation of their Judgments. You see how great necessity (to avoid Schism) they place in our subjection to a Forreign Jurisdiction. The Confutation you shall have of all together.

Chap. IX. *The Judgment of Archbishop Laud, as delivered by Dr. Heylin, and by himself.*

§. 1. **I**N the Life of Archbishop *Laud*, Pag. 414, 415, 416, 412. [' Touching the Design of working a Reconciliation betwixt us and Rome, I find it charged on him by another Writer

ter (*Fuller Ch. Hist. lib. 11. p. 217.*) who holds
 it as unlawful to be undertaken, as it was impossi-
 ble to be effected — *Answ.* If it be a Crime it's
Novum Crimen of a New stamp, never coined be-
 fore. — As to the Impossibility, many Men of
 Eminence for Parts and Piety have thought other-
 wise. — (*Spalatensis* and *Sancta Clara* are named
 as Reconcilers.) And if without prejudice to
 the Truth, the Controversies might have been
 composed, it is most probable that other Prote-
 stant Churches would have sued by their Agents
 to be included in the Peace. If not, the Church
 of England had lost nothing by it, as being hated
 by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lu-
 therans.

Admitting then that such a Reconciliation was
 endeavoured betwixt the Agents of both Chur-
 ches, Let us next see what our great States-
 men have discoursed upon that particular, on
 what terms the Agreement was to have been
 made, and how far they proceeded in it. And
 first, the Book entituled, *The Pope's Nuntio*, af-
 firmed to have been written by the Venetian
 Embassador at his being in England doth dis-
 course thus: As to a Reconciliation, saith he,
 between the Churches of England and Rome,
 there were made some general Propositions and
 Overtures by the Archbishop's Agents, they assu-
 ring that his Grace was very much disposed
 thereto: and that if it was not accomplished in
 his Life-time; it would prove a work of more
 difficulty after his Death; that in very truth for
 the last three Years the Archbishop had intro-
 duced some Innovations, approaching nearer the
 Rites and Forms of Rome: That the Bishop of
Chichester,

' *Chichester*, a great Confident of his Grace, the
 ' Lord Treasurer, and Eight other Bishops of his
 ' Grace's Party, did most passionately desire a Re-
 ' conciliation with the Church of *Rome*. That
 ' they did day by day recede from their ancient
 ' Tenets to accommodate with the Church of
 ' *Rome*. That therefore the Pope on his part
 ' ought to make some Steps to meet them, and
 ' the Court of *Rome* remit something of its rigour
 ' in Doctrine, or otherwise no accord would
 ' be. The Composition on both Sides in so good
 ' a forwardness before *Pauzani* left the Kingdom,
 ' that the Archbishop and the Bishop of *Chichester*
 ' had often said that there were but two sorts of
 ' People like to hinder the Reconciliation, the
 ' Puritans among the Protestants, and the Jesuits
 ' among the Catholicks.

' Let us see the Judgment and Relation of ano-
 ' ther Author in a Gloss or Comment on the
 ' former, entituled, *The English Pope*, Printed at
 ' *London* the same Year 1643. And he will tell
 ' us that after *Con* had undertook the managing
 ' of Affairs, the Matter began to grow towards
 ' some Agreement. The King required, saith he,
 ' such a Dispensation from the Pope, as his Catho-
 ' lick Subjects might resort to the Protestant
 ' Church, and take the Oaths of Supremacy and
 ' Fidelity; and that the Pope's Jurisdiction should
 ' be declared to be but of Human Right. And
 ' so far had the Pope consented, that whatsoever
 ' did concern the King, should have been really
 ' performed so far as other Catholick Princes do
 ' usually enjoy and expect as their due: and so far
 ' as the Bishops were to be Independent both
 ' from King and Pope. There was no fear of
 ' breach

'breach on the Pope's part : So that upon the
 'Point the Pope was to content himself with us
 'in *England*, with a Priority instead of a Superior-
 'rity over other Bishops, and with a Primacy in-
 'stead of a Supremacy in these parts of Christen-
 'dom : which I conceive no man of Learning and
 'Sobriety would have grudged to grant him : It
 'was also condescended to in the Name of the
 'Pope, that Marriage might be permitted to
 'Priests, that the Communion might be admini-
 'stred *sub utraq; specie*, and the Liturgy be offi-
 'ciated in the English Tongue ; And though the
 'Author adds not long after that it was to be
 'suspected that so far as the inferior Clergy and
 'the People were concerned, the after-perfor-
 'mance was to be left to the Pope's discretion,
 'yet this was but his own suspicion without any
 'ground at all. And to obtain a Reconciliation
 'on these Advantages, the Archbishop had all
 'the reason in the world to do as he did, in or-
 'dering the Lord's Table to be set where the
 'Altar stood, and making the accustomed reve-
 'rence in all approaches towards it and accesses
 'to it, and in beautifying and adorning Churches,
 'and celebrating Divine Service with all due
 'Solemnities : in taking Care that all offensive
 'and exasperating Passages should be expunged
 'out of all such Books as were brought to the
 'Press ; and for reducing the extravagancy of
 'some Opinions to an even temper. His Maje-
 'sty had the like reason also for tolerating law-
 'ful Recreations on the Sundays and Holidays,
 'the rigorous restraint whereof had made some
 'Papists think (those most especially of the vul-
 'gar sort whom it most concerned) that all ho-
 'nest

nest Pastimes were incompatible with our Religion. And if he approved auricular Confession and shewed himself willing to introduce it into the use of the Church, as both our Authors say he did, it is no more than what the Liturgy commends to the caré of the Penitent (though we find not the word Auricular in it) and what the Canons have provided for in the point of security for such as shall be willing to Confess themselves. But whereas we are told by one of our Authors that the King should say, he would use force to make it be received, were it not for fear of Sedition among the People; yet it is but in one of our Authors neither, who hath no other Author for it, but a nameless Doctor. And in the way to so happy an Agreement (though they all stand accused for it by *The English Pope*, p. 15.) *Sparrow* may be excused for Pleading for Auricular Confession, and *Watts* for Pennance, *Heylin* for Adoration towards the Altar, and *Montague* for such a qualified Praying to Saints as his Book maintaineth against the Papists.

If you would know how far they had proceeded towards this happy Reconciliation, the Pope's Nuntio will assure us thus: That the Universities, Bishops and Divines of this Realm, did daily embrace Catholick Opinions, though they professed not so much with Pen or Mouth for fear of the Puritans. For example, they held that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church, that the Pope is Superior to all Bishops; that to him it pertaineth to call General Councils; that it's lawful to Pray for the Souls of the Departed; that Altars ought to be erected of Stone; In

sum

sum, that they believed all that is taught by
 the Church, but not by the Court of *Rome*.
 Another of their Authors tells us, that those
 among us of greatest Worth, Learning and Au-
 thority began to love Temper and Moderation,
 that their Doctrines began to be altered in many
 things, for which their Progenitors forsook the
 visible Church of Christ: As for example, The
 Pope not Antichrist, Prayers for the Dead,
Limbus Patrum, Pictures, that the Church hath
 Authority in determining Controversies of Faith,
 and to interpret Scripture; About Free Will,
 Predestination, Universal Grace, that all our
 Works are not Sins; Merit of good Works,
 inherent Justice, that Faith alone doth not justi-
 fie; Charity to be preferred before knowledge;
 the authority of Traditions; Commandments
 possible to be kept; that in Exposition of Scrip-
 ture they are by Canon bound to follow the
 Fathers; And that the once fearful Names of
 Priests and Altars are used willingly in their
 Talk and Writings,] In which Compliances, so
 far forth as they speak the truth (for in some
 Points, through Ignorance of the one, and Ma-
 lice of the other, they are much mistaken) there
 is scarce any thing which may not well consist
 with the established (though for a time discon-
 tinued) Doctrine of the Church of *England*,
 the Articles whereof, as the same Jesuit hath
 observed, seem patient or ambitious rather of
 some sence, wherein they may seem Catholick.
 And such a sence is put upon them by him that
 calls himself *Franciscus à Sancta Clara*, as before
 was said. And if upon such Compliances as those
 before, on the part of the English, the Condi-
 tions offered by the Pope might have been Con-
 firmed,

‘firmed, who seeth not that the greatest benefit
 ‘of the Reconciliation must have redounded to
 ‘this Church, to the King and People. His Ma-
 ‘jesty’s Security provided for by the Oaths of
 ‘Supremacy and Allegiance, so far as it con-

(b) And Men taught
 to be Perjured, by taking
 in Foreign Ecclesiastical
 Power.

(i) And yet Obey his
 Councils Canons.

‘cerned his Temporal
 ‘Power, (b) The Bishops
 ‘of *England* to be Inde-
 ‘pendent on the Pope of
 ‘*Rome*. (i) The Clergy to
 ‘be permitted the use of
 ‘Marriage, the People to
 ‘receive the Communion in both Kinds, and all
 ‘Divine Offices officiated in the English Tongue;
 ‘no Innovation made in Doctrine, but only in
 ‘qualifying some Expressions, and discharging some
 ‘Outlandish Glosses that were put upon them:
 ‘And seeing this, what Man could be so void of
 ‘Charity, so uncompassionate of the Miseries and
 ‘Distractions of Christendom, as not to wish
 ‘from the very bottom of his Soul that the Re-
 ‘conciliation had proceeded on so good terms;
 ‘as not to magnifie the Men to succeeding Ages,
 ‘who were the Instrument Authors of so great

(k) Christ hath given us a
 sufficient Law for the Go-
 vernment of the Church;
 else, saith *Gerson*, he were
 not a perfect Lawgiver:

Must we be beholden to the Pope for leaving us a little of that
 which Christ gave us? Who gave him Power to take any of
 it from us? Would our Conciliators have magnified the Men
 that for the Peace of *England* would have agreed with *Crom-
 well* to allow the King the Isle of *Wight*, or *Wales*? Or to
 have made a Law that every Highway Robber shall re-urn one
 half to the Owner? And with what Conscience could the Sub-
 jects of Christ have obeyed all the rest of the Usurpers sinful
 Canons?

‘a Blessing. (k) So far
 ‘*Dr. Heylin*, who was the
 ‘Archbishop’s Intimate
 ‘and Agent.

*Archbishop Laud's own words as laid down in his
Book defended by Dr. Stillingfleet.*

§ 1. The Archbishop disclaimeth the Divine Institution and the Infallibility of General Councils: But he thinks we must allow them ['external Obedience; and that honour and privilege which all other GREAT COURTS have; that there be a Declaration of the invalidity of their Decrees, as well as of the LAWS of other Courts, before private Men can take Liberty to refuse Obedience. Part. 3. c. 2.

And page 540. 'It doth not follow because the Church may erre, that therefore she may not govern. For the Church hath not only a Pastoral Power to Teach and Direct, but a Prætorian Power to controul and censure too, where Errors and Crimes are against fundamental Points, or of great Consequence.] Thus the Archbishop.

It is the Universal Church and Councils that he speaks of. But, 1. There is no such thing on Earth as he calls the Church, that is, One Universal Aristocracy that hath Power of Governing all the Christian World in one Council or otherwise, as one Supream.

2. General Councils of divers Kingdoms o're all the World, are no more a Court than the Assembly at *Nimeguen* was.

3. No Obedience is due to them, but only consent for Concord, so far as their Canons tend to true Concord, and that by virtue of Christ's Law, for Peace and Concord. Obedience hath no formal Object but *Authorita-*

tem Imperantis ; But Assemblies for Concord have no *Imperium*.

4. No Clergyman as such hath any but Pastoral and Teaching Power, and as a Tutor to order his own School. The Power of the Keys is noother.

5. Mens holding and renouncing of Communion with other Persons or Churches may be without Governing Power. I am not Governor of all that I hold or renounce Communion with. No Bishops have power Judicially to determine of Individuals, who shall have Communion with every Parish Church on Earth : If they have, they must hear them all speak for themselves before they judge them (in or out.) They are not Governors of foreign Kings and Kingdoms, though in their Government of their particular Churches they must all agree to observe one Rule, that is, Christ's Laws.

6. There never was an Universal Council of all the Churches, but only of one Empire (a part of that) nor ever will be, till the Church be so destroyed as to be brought into a narrow space (which God forbid).

As to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defence of all this, I take him not to approve of all that he blameth not : And if he did, I believe on second thoughts he will more retract this than, he did his *Irenicon*.

Chap. X. Dr. Peter Heylin's own Judgment.

§. 1. **B**Ecause we come newly from repeating Dr. Heylin's words of Archbishop *Land*, though

though they fully shew his own Judgment, I will here annex some more.

1. There is a Book written by a Papist, called *Historical Collections of the Reformation*, gathered most out of Dr. Heylin's own words (and some out of others) describing the Reformers and Reformation so odiously, as greatly serveth the Priests to turn Protestants to their Church: And as the Jesuit *Maymowburgh* maketh Dr. Heylin's Writings to have Converted the late Dutcheffs of York, it's like it was this *Collection* out of him.

2. In his Book on the Creed, speaking of the Catholick Church, he saith,

Pag. 407. 'Such is the Ambition of the Pope of Rome, that unless he may be taken for the Catholick Church, he passeth not for being reckoned a Church at all: And yet this is of the two the Lovelier Error. Better the Church be all Head, than no Head at all: And such a Church that is all Body and no Head at all have some of our Reformers modelled in their late Platforms.']

Ans. Is Christ no Head at all? Or is any other Person or Court capable of Governing all Christians on Earth? All Protestants hold that the whole Church hath no Head but Christ.

Pag. 408. 'Speaking still of the Catholick Church he saith [The Government of the Church not being Monarchical, as our Masters of the Church of Rome would have it, nor Democratical as the Fathers of the Presbytery, and Brethren of the Independency have given it out, both in their Practice and their Platform, it must be Aristocratical.]

Ansiv. This is a gross Slander of the Presbyterians and Independents. Did ever the Presbyterians or Independents say, that All Christians on Earth must Govern the whole Church in one Meeting, or by Delegates? where be the Laws that any of them pretend all Christians made? Or the Judgments they pass on any Persons after exploration? The Presbyterians are for an Aristocratical Government of National Churches, and some few Independents are for popular Government in single Congregations; but no further.

2. Is the Church now Governed by One Aristocracy, that is, *per Optimates* that are One *Persona Politica* by Vote ruling all the Christian World? Where is their Meeting? What be their Laws? Whom do they so try and judge? An Universal Governing Aristocracy is more impossible and irrational than an Universal Monarchy Civil or Ecclesiastical. Every Bishop and Presbytery Governing his own Church, and these keeping Concord by just Correspondency, is no liker an Universal Aristocracy, than an Assembly of Princes for Concordant Government of their Dominions, or than all the Mayors and Justices ruling their several Corporations and Provinces make the Government of *England* Aristocratical.

Pag. 409. Saith he, [' Every Bishop, where-ever he be fixt and resident, hath like St. Paul an universal Care over all the Churches, which since they could not exercise by personal Conferences, they did it in the Primitive times, before they had the benefit of General Councils, by Letters, Messengers, and Agents for the Communicating of their Counsel, and imparting their Advice one to another as the emergent Occasions

'cations of the Church did require the same.
'These Letters they called *Literas formatas* &
'*Communicatorias*.

Answ. Thus Bishop *Gunning* and others. But,
1. St. Paul's Apostolick Power enabled him to do
the Work of an Apostle (which is, to plant
Churches in as much of the World as they could,
and deliver them Christ's Doctrine and Laws in-
fallibly as receiving them by sight and hearing or
miraculous revelation.) And this Power each
Apostle could exercise singly, and not only by
Voting as part of a College; the Spirit of Christ
teaching them all the same Doctrine. But Bishops
have no such Office or Power.

2. There are several ways of expressing a Care
of all the Churches. Every Christian must do it
by private Endeavours. Every Official Preacher by
Preaching where he is called. Every Pastor by
guiding his Flock in Concord with all true Chri-
stians, in the things which Christ hath made ne-
cessary to their Concord: And if Archbishops have
right to a larger Province, they must do it in their
proper Province, *per partes*, & not as one Aristocracy.

3. It is granted, that as all Christians and Bi-
shops must have a Love to all the Churches, and
a Care to do them good in their several Places,
so Concord in things necessary is a great means
of that good, and the ancient Pastors endeavou-
red it by Messages, Letters and Synods; and so
must we. But what Universal Laws were made
by *Literæ formatæ*? What formal Judgments
were past by them? Where did the Writers
meet first to hear the Accused and examine Wit-
nesses? Or must all believe the report of every
single Pastor? And was it all the Bishops on Earth,

or a major part, that wrote these Legislative and Judicial Letters? What strange things can some Men gather from meer Communion and Concord? Bishops had then a Necessity of getting the common consent of as many of their Order as they could, to make their Government of force to the People, that were all Volunteers, and not constrained by any Magistrate? And it's useful still to the same end.

4. And we grant them that every Bishop and Presbyter, that giveth counsel to other Churches doth not do it as a meer private Man, but as a Bishop: that is, One that by Office is authorized to give such Pastoral advice to such as he is called to give it to; But not as one that hath the charge of Governing other Mens Flocks, or is a Member of an Aristocratical, Supream Senate, Parliament, Court, or Voting States. Suppose each Hospital have its allowed Physitian, who in doubtful Cases consulteth with many others; Their counsel is the counsel of Physitians; that is, of Men licensed for that Work and Care: But it proveth them not to have any proper Governing Power over his Hospital or Patients.

5. If every Bishop be a Governor not only *in*, but of the whole World or Church, it is either *Singly*, or *Collectively* as part of a Governing Company. If singly, it's a monstrous Body that hath so many thousand Universal Heads. If collectively, then no one is a Supream Governor, but a part of that Body which is such. And no one on Earth can act as such a part of One Aristocracy, without presence with the rest, hearing what they say, and what Actors and Witnesses say, and gathering Votes.

Pag. 411. 'He confesseth out of *Socrates* about
 'the Emperors Power in Church Matters, that
 '[from the time in which Emperors received the Faith,
 'Ecclesia negotia ex eorum nutu pendere visa sunt
 'Socr. l. 5. Proem.

And if so, why is Mr. *Morice* angry with me
 for saying, That Bishops used in Councils much
 to follow the Emperors minds. 2. And then it
 will be but an odd Universal Legislative and Ju-
 dicial Sovereign Power over all the World, which
 dependeth on the consent of so many Princes, Pro-
 testants, Papists, Mahometans, Heathens, Jaco-
 bites, Nestorians, &c. as a General Council must
 be called by or depend on. And it will be an end-
 less Controversie, what Princes have or have not
 a Power to consent or dissent, that their Subjects
 shall go to such Councils. But also Consultation,
 is not Government.

Chap. XI. *The Judgment of Mr. Herbert
 Thorndike, a late Eminent Divine of the
 Church of England.*

§ 1. **M**R. *Thorndike* hath written so much on
 this Subject that I need no more than
 refer the Reader to his Books, for the discovery
 of his mind. The sum of his late Writings (these
 thirty years past) is to call us all into one visible
 Catholick Church which is unified by one Hu-
 mane Government of all, out of which nothing
 will excuse us from Schism, or make our failing
 tolerable. His arguments for an Universal Ari-
 stocracy answered by Dr. *Izaak Barrow* in the end
 of

of his Treatise of Supremacy, I will not here recite, because they are there so fully and learnedly confuted.

§ 2. In his [*Just Weights and Measures*] he tells us that the Church of *Rome* being a true Church, Reformation lyeth in Restoration, and not in Separation. (a)

(a) Confusion. 1. The form denominateth: The Church of *Rome* which we separate from is a pretended Sovereignty over all Christians. This is no true Church of Christ. 2. But we separate not from them in point of Christianity. But 1. From their Usurpation. 2. And other Sins.

Page 5. he saith, [' Who will take upon him to shew us that the Worship of the Host in the Papists is Idolatry.

Page 6, 7. ' They that separate from the Church of *Rome* as Idolaters are thereby Schismatics before God.

' For in plain terms we make our selves Schismatics by grounding our Reformation on this pretence.

' Should this Church declare that the Change which we call Reformation is grounded on this supposition, I must then acknowledge that we are Schismatics.

Ch. 2. ' Is to disprove them that make the Pope Antichrist, and Papists Idolaters, and shew that the supposition of one Catholick Visible Church, is the ground of all Communion and supposed to Reformation. And Ch. 3. Nothing to be changed but on that Ground of such Visible Unity.

Ch. 5. ' If our Lord trust his Disciples and their Successors with the Rule of his Church, he trusteth them also to make Laws for the Ruling of

‘of it — These Laws are as Visible as the
 ‘Laws of any Kingdom or Common-wealth that
 ‘is or ever was are Visible — I maintain the
 ‘Popes Canon Law (and the same is to be said
 ‘of the Canon Law, by which the Patriarch of
 ‘*Constantinople* now Governs the Eastern Church)
 ‘to be derived from those Rules whereby the
 ‘Disciples of our Lord and their Successors go-
 ‘verned the Primitive Church in Unity. — The
 ‘power of Giving Laws to the Church ; the
 ‘power of Dispensing the Exchequer which God
 ‘hath provided for the Church, are in the Go-
 ‘vernors of the Church ; and the power of ad-
 ‘mitting into and excluding out. It’s a Visible
 ‘Society founded by God under the Name of the
 ‘Catholick Church, on the command of holding
 ‘Communion with it.

Page 41. ‘The Church in the form which I
 ‘state it is a *standing Synod*, able by the consent of
 ‘the *Chief Churches*, containing the consent of
 ‘their resorts to conclude the whole.

Page 48. ‘The Church of *Rome* hath and ought
 ‘to have when it shall please to hear reason, a
 ‘Regular pre-eminence, over the rest of Christen-
 ‘dom in these Western parts. And he that is able
 ‘to judge and willing to consider shall find that
 ‘Pre-eminence the *Only Reasonable* means to pre-
 ‘serve so great a Body in Unity. And therefore
 ‘I am not my self tyed to justify *Henry* the
 ‘Eighth in disclaiming all such pre-eminence.

Page 48. ‘That the difference may be visible
 ‘between the *Infinite* and the *Regular* Power of the
 ‘Pope.

Page 91. ‘The perpetual Rule of the Church
 ‘makes

(b) And having before made the Church of *England* Schismaticks he makes all Schismaticks that Communicate with it.

‘ makes them Hereticks to
‘ the Church that Com-
‘ municate with Hereticks
‘ and Schismaticks that
‘ Communicate with Schi-
‘ maticks. (b)

Page 94. ‘ The Flesh and Blood of Christ by
‘ Incarnation, the Elements by Consecration be-
‘ ing united to the Spirit, that is, the Godhead of
‘ Christ, become both One Sacramentally, by be-
‘ ing both One with the Spirit or Godhead, to
‘ the conveying of Gods Spirit to a Christian.

Page 125. ‘ The worshipping the Host in the
‘ Papacy is not Idolatry.

Page 132. ‘ He saith that the Oath of Supre-
‘ macy is but to exclude the Popes Temporal
‘ power: But because the words seem to exclude
‘ the power of General Councils, of which the
‘ Pope is and ought to be the chief Member, of
‘ necessity the Law gives great offence: And that
‘ offence is the sin of the Kingdom, and calls for
‘ Gods Vengeance on it; which though all are in-
‘ volved in. the account in the other World will
‘ lye on them, which may change it and will
‘ not.

Page 134. ‘ But the authority of those Divines
‘ of this Church who have declared the sence of
‘ the Oath of Supremacy with publick allowance
‘ are now alledged by the Papists themselves to
‘ infer that the matter of it is lawful (as exclu-
‘ ding only the Popes Civil Power.)

Page 141. ‘ We receive the Body and Blood
‘ of Christ, and by consequence his Spirit Hypo-
‘ statically united to the same, to inable us to per-
‘ form.

Page 149. 'The Church of *Rome* cannot be
'charged with Idolatry. The Pope cannot be
'Antichrist.

Ch. 22. 'The Reformation pretended is abo-
'minable and Apostasie, and the usual Preaching
'a hinderance to Salvation; and new Homilies
'to be formed to restrain Preaching.

Page 146. 'I confess I can hope for no good
'end of any dispute without supposing the sence
'of the Articles of One Catholick Church, which
'hath carried us through this discourse, for the
'Principle on which all matter in debate is to be
'tryed.

'P. 214. And oft he professeth that Presbyters
'not ordained by Bishops, baptize and give the
'Eucharist, void of the Effect of a Sacrament, and
'only by Sacriledge—speaketh against killing and
'and banishing—[But this will require the like
'Moderation to be extended to the Recusants of
'the Church of *Rome*, (p. 234.) The Recusants being
'for the most part of the Good Families of the
'Nation, will take it for a part of their Nobility
'freely to profess themselves in their Religion; if
'they understand themselves: Whereas the Se-
'ctaries, being people of mean quality for the most
'part, cannot be presumed to stand on their repu-
'tation so much.

'In his Book called *The Forbearance of Penalties*,
'c. 3. p. 12, 13. he makes the foundation of all
'Union to be the Government and Laws of the
'Church as visibly Catholick, which Laws must
'be one and the same, the violating whereof is
'the forfeiture of the same (Communion.) And
'here I crave leave to call All Canons, All Cu-
'stoms of the Church, whether concerning the
'Rites

' Rites of God's Service, or other Observations,
' by one and the same name of *Laws* of the
' Church.

' P. 23. As for the Canons of the Church, it was
' never necessary to the maintenance of Commu-
' nion that the same Customs should be held in
' all parts of the Church. It was only necessary the
' several Customs should be held by the same Au-
' thority. That the same Authority instituted se-
' veral Customs; for so they might be changed by
' the same Authority, and yet Unity remain.

' Whereas questioning the Authority by que-
' stioning whether the acts of it be agreeable to
' God's Law or not, how should Unity be main-
' tained? It is manifest that they (the Fathers)
' could not have agreed in the Laws of the
' Church, if any had excepted against any thing
' used in any part of the Church, as if God's Law
' had been infringed by it. — It followeth of
' necessity, that nothing
' can be disowned by this
' Church as contrary to
' God's Law, which hold-
' eth by the Primitive
' Church. (c.)

(c) Here is 1. An Univer-
sal Legislative Power over
all the Church on Earth.
2. This Power is in Coun-
cils, of which the Pope is
the chief Member; and the
only reasonable means of

the Union of so great a Body, is his Regular Power as distinct
from Infinite Power. 3. All the Canons Rites and Customs,
are these Laws of the Church. 4. All Kings and Kingdoms are
bound to obey them. 5. No man must question whether these
Laws or Customs, or any of them are contrary to God's Law.
6. The men that must have this Absolute Power over all the
Kings and Kingdoms on Earth, that will be Christian, are them-
selves the Subjects of the Turks, the Moore, the Emperor of
Abassia, the Persian, the Emperor of *Indastan*, called the *Mogul*,
the Kings of *Poland*, *Hungary*, *Spain*, *France*, *England*, *Denmark*,
Sweden, the Emperor of *Germany*, and abundance more; when
it is known that few Bishops are chosen in any of these Coun-
treys

treys Mahometans or Papists, but such as the Princes like, and that they dare not go against their wills in any great matter. 7. Their minds are known already, and consequently what they would do in Councils, if all these Princes would agree to call an Universal Council. The Major Vote, if it were called in *Mesopotamia*, or that way would be such as *Rome* calleth Hereticks: If called in *Greece* it would be Greeks: If in *Italy*, or *Germany*, or *France*, they would be Papists; no where Protestants. Few would travel above a thousand miles to the Council. 8. Tho' one would think that this platform of Governing the whole Earth, could be believed by no man in his wits, yet you see Learned men are so far deceived: And it is by judging of the *World* by the Old Roman Empire. There indeed Councils were Nationally General: They were Courts: They had Legislative Power and Pretorian Command: None might appeal from them for Relief in *Foro Humano*. Emperors gave them this Power. It was but rational, over their own Subjects: What Power had they over others? The Convocation in *England*, or the General Assembly in *Scotland* may be made and called a Court by the King: But *France* or *Spain* were never Governed by them, nor took them to be over them unquestionable Legislators: Yea, I believe King and Parliament at home are not so subject to their Laws.

Page 27. He saith (as Mr. *Dodwell*) 'It is agreed on by the whole Church, that Baptism in Heresie or Schism (that is, when a man gives up himself to the Communion of Hereticks or Schismaticks by receiving Baptism from them) though it may be true Baptism, and not to be repeated, yet it is not available to Salvation, making him accessory to Heresie or Schism that is so Baptized. (d)

(d) And are not these unmerciful men that will let men take up with a damning Eaptism, and will not rebaptize them that they may have a saving Bap-

tism, which yet they hold necessary to Salvation? They fear Anabaptism it seems more than mens Damnation.

Page 28. 'The promise of Baptism is not available,

'able, unless it be deposited with the true Church;

(e) The true Church that is an Usurped Power of Universal Legislation, is here made by him and Mr. Dodwell as necessary to

'nor to him that continu-
'eth not in the true Church
'that may exact the pro-
'mise deposited with it.(e)

Salvation as Christ, and more than the holy Scriptures. But what will now become of all the Papists that (by dispensation) come in to Protestant Churches? They also are all damned as Schismatics for communicating with them; unless he forgot to except them that the Pope dispenseth with.

Page 33. ['It is out of love to the Reforma-
'tion that I insist on such a Principle as may serve
'to reunite us with the Church of Rome; being
'well assured that we can never be well reunited
'with our selves otherwise. Yet not only the Re-
'formation, but the common Christianity must

(f) How much wiser are these men than Christ and St. Paul, who made it the duty of all that were baptized Christians, to live as

'needs be lost in the di-
'visions, which will ne-
'ver have an end other-
'wise. (f)

one Body of Christ in Love? *Him that is weak in the faith receive, but not to doubtful disputations, Rom. 14. 1. The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. He that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men.*

Pag. 111. ['If it be said that it is not visible
'where those Usurpations took place, I shall al-
'low all the time which the Code of the Canons

(g) This yet is some mercy to us: But is it as your grant? 1. How will this stand with all that you have written for the continued Universal Legislative

'contains, which Pope A-
'drian sent to Charles the
'Great, pag. 128. which I
'would have this Church
'to own. (g)

Church? Did it cease at *Charles the Great's* time? and yet are all damned that are not subject to it? 2. How shall we be sure that the Canons bind us till *Adrian's* time, and not since? 3. But Sir, we take him for a Papist that is for all the Canons and Customs till *Charles the Great*: And there are many things before that which we cannot Conform to without renouncing the Laws and sufficient Government of Christ, which we cannot do upon such pitiful reasonings as yours.

In Mr. *Thorndike's* large folio Book, there is yet much more for his Universal Legislative Aristocracy mixt with Regular Papacy. The sum of all is, The Pope Governing at least in the West by the Canons in the intervals of General Councils (that is, alwaies,) and as the chief Member with Councils making Laws for all the World. Thus the *French* and *Italian* Papists differ whether the Pope shall Govern the World as the King of *Poland* doth his Land; or, say some, as the Duke of *Venice*, or rather as the King of *France*. But Protestants know no such thing as an Universal Legislative Church, nor owns any Universal Laws but Gods; unless you mean *Nationally Universal*, as in the Empire Councils and Laws were called. I refer you again to Dr. *Barrows* Confutation of the rest of Mr. *Thorndikes*.

Chap. XII. *The Judgment of Dr. Sparrow Bishop of Norwich, and divers others.*

' **B**ishop Sparrow Pref. to Collect. [*As my Father sent me, so send I you.* Here committing the Government of the Church to his Apostles, our Lord Commissions them with the same Power

‘ Power that was committed to him, for that purpose when he was on Earth ; with the same necessary standing Power that he had exercised as

(a) The standing Power of the Head or Sovereign, and that of Official Ministers much differ.

‘ Man for the good of the Church. (a) Less cannot in reason be thought to be granted, than all Power necessary for the well

‘ and peaceable Government of the Church. ‘ And such a power is this of Making Laws.

(b) All necessary power since Christ by his Apostles published his Universal Laws, is but that all Ministers in their several Churches guide the Flocks by these Laws of Christ, and teach them the people, and determine of incidental Circumstances *pro loco & tempore* ; and not to make new Universal Laws.

‘ (b) This is a Commission in general for making ‘ Laws: Then in particular for making Articles ‘ and Decisions of Doctrines controverted the ‘ power is more explicate ‘ and express, *Mat. 28. All power is given me: Go therefore and teach all Nations,* ‘ that is, with authority and

‘ by virtue of the power given me. And what is ‘ it to teach the Truth with authority, but to command and oblige all people to receive the Truth

(c) Christ expressly limiteth the Apostles to teach the Churches what he had commanded them, and promiseth to give them the Spirit to bring all to their remembrance, and lead them to all Truth.

‘ so taught ? (c) And this ‘ power was not given to ‘ the Apostles persons only ; for Christ then promised to be with them ‘ in that Office to the end ‘ of the World ; that is, ‘ to them and their Suc-

‘ cessors in the Pastoral Office : To the Apostles or Bishops that should succeed them to the end of the

the World. (d) To this One holy Church our Lord committed in trust the most holy Faith, &c. commanding under penalties and censures all her Children to receive that sence, and to profess it in such expressive words and forms as may directly determine the doubt. Thus she did in the great *Nicene Council*— This authority in determining Doubts and Controversies the Church hath practised in ALL AGES, and her constant practice is the best Interpreter of her right. (e)

(d) When the King sends out Judges and Justices he doth not make them Kings or Legislators. The Apostles had the Spirit for promulgating and recording Christs Laws: Others have it only to preserve and teach them, and not to make more such, as if they were insufficient, and Christian Religion were still to be changed by new additions, and were half Divine and half Humane: Gods Word and the Bishops in medley.

Such Councils and practices as prove not her right. Else why do not you now practise accordingly? — Bishop *Guning* owneth but six General Councils, which were all but in three Ages. And others but four, and none that I know of but eight, who do not openly profess Popery.

(e) The three first Ages had no General Councils: The three next had National or Imperial General Councils. The thousand years last past (which you include in [All Ages] had

Hath Christ given any new commands since those which he sent the Apostles to deliver? Have you any more of his commands to give us than the Apostles delivered in their times? If you may make new ones, you have more than Apostolick power, which was to teach whatever Christ commanded them. He is with them to the end of the World. 1. In blessing the Word delivered and recorded by them. 2. In blessing those that teach it. But not those that add to it the Supplement of their own Universal Laws.

And which is the Church that in all Ages (these thousand years) have had this power? Three parts of the Christian World say, It is not the Roman. The Roman Church say,

It is not the Greeks. Both say, It is not they in *Abassia*, *Egypt*, *Mesopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Georgia*, &c. The Protestants confess it is not they. And is obedience to an unknowable Power necessary to Concord and Salvation ?

I shall not tire the Reader with the needless recitation of many more late Divines that lived since 1630. enough are known. Those that have defended *Grotius* of late I pass no judgment on; you may read their own Books and judge as you see cause; viz. *Dr. Thomas Pierce* now Dean of *Salisbury*, and the famous Preface to Archbishop *Bromhall's* Book against me, &c. I fear all this History is needless. Men now laugh at me for proving by Mens writings their endeavours to subject the King and Kingdom to a Foreign Jurisdiction, when they say it is more sensibly and dreadfully proving it self.

Chap. XIII. *Dr. Parker's Judgment* (since *Bishop of Oxford*.)

THE last mentioned Author *Dr. Sam. Parker*, besides what he hath said against me in his large Preface before Archbishop *Bromhall's* Book, hath since gone so far beyond all his Fellows, that finding himself unable to answer this Argument otherwise, [The World must not have one Universal Humane Civil Governor (King or Aristocracy) *ergo*, It must not have one Humane Priest or Church Governor] desperately denieth the Antecedent, and saith, that though *de facto* the Kings of the Earth have not one Sovereign over them

them all (that is meer Man) they ought to have. *Audite Reges.* I cannot conjecture who he meaneth unless it be the Pope, and he be of Cardinal *Bertrand's* mind, that God had not been wise if he had not made one Man a Vice-God, or his Deputy to Rule all the World: For sure he never dreamed that all Kings and States on Earth would meet or voluntarily agree to chuse one Universal King over them.

I met newly with an extraordinary Wit, who saith that after the Conflagration, in the Millennium of the New Heaven and Earth, Christ or his *Vice-Roy* will triumphantly Rule, &c. But 1. I never read before of a *Vice-Roy* after the Conflagration, which he saith will first consume Antichrist. 2. I know not how much of the New World he assigns to this *Vice-Roy's* Government; for if *Gog* and *Magog* after cover the Earth, and the New Generation be numerous, (which he thinks the Earth will bring forth like lower Animals,) it may be the New *Jerusalem* may be so small that one *Vice-Roy* may Rule it. 3. But sure that holy Generation will make Government and Obedience far easier things than now they are.

Chap. XIV. *Dr. Saywell's Arguments for a Foreign Jurisdiction considered.*

§ 1. **T**HIS Dr. (who I may well suppose speaketh his Lord and Masters sence) is so open as to let us know, 1. That it is the Popes Power above General Councils, which they call

Popery. 2. And that they join with the conciliar Party in point of Church Government, and so take not them for *Papists*, who hold not that Sovereignty of the Pope, but only his Primacy. 3. That it is but the *Jesuited Party* of the Church of Rome, which they renounce. 4. That they also renounce all Nonconforming Protestants as a *Jesuited Party*. So that he would tempt us to believe what some affirm that their design hath long been to subdue the *Jesuits* and *Reformed Churches* (or rather destroy these) and to strike up a Union with the French, and maintain that they are no *Papists* as to Government. But though the Power of old Protestants in *England* were never so much subdued to them, methinks the *Jesuits* Interest in *France* should resist them, unless the *Jesuits* themselves be (as some vainly think) fawn out with the Pope, and then it will be the *Jesuited Party* which these Men will own.

§. 2. But to his Arguments, [Page 342. Mr. B. saith, ' *I have earnestly desired and searched to know the proof of such a Legislative Universal Power, and I cannot find it. But if Mr. B. would seriously consider these Texts, he might find that obedience is due to the Church, Mat. 18. If he neglect to hear the Church let him be to thee as an Heathen Man and a Publican. Now as one private Man may neglect to hear the Episcopal Church to which he belongs, so the Episcopal, Provincial and National Church may also prove Heretical, and neglect to hear the Catholick Church; but the Universal Church can never fail, for the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it. And if more Persons, or particular Churches give offence by Heresie, Schism, &c. the Church Universal, or the rest of the Bishops may re-*
prove

'prove them for it, and then there is no reason why
'one Man should be censured and many go free; and
'consequently our Saviour hath established the Authority of his Church over all Christians, as well particular Churches as private Men.

Ans. 1. Let us try this Argument by the like. (God hath commanded obedience to Kings, and said, *He that will not hear the King and Judge, shall be put to death.* But Kings and their Kingdoms may be Criminal: And if private men must obey Authority, or be put to death, so must Kings and Kingdoms? Why should they escape? Therefore all Kings and Kingdoms must obey One Universal Humane King or Kingdom under Christ.] Do you think this is true? No; There is no such Universal Humane Empire, Monarchical or Aristocratical. No Mortal Men are capable of it, any more than of Ruling the World in the Moon, or the Fish in the Sea, (but of a part only.) So there is no such Universal Church Power; but particular there is.

As to your reason, I answer, God is the Universal King, and he only is the punisher of all Sovereign Powers, whether Monarchs, Aristocracies or Mixt. (which I have ever asserted, though the Lying Spirit hath feigned the contrary.) God hath several ways to Rule and Judge them here, and his final Judgment is at hand. And the case is like with *National Churches*, save that their own Princes may punish offending Clergy-men.

2. One Person or Nation may renounce Communion with another as Heretical, without any Ruling Power over them: And the other may do the same by them (deserving it) Am I a Governor or Legislator over every one that I may

refuse to eat or pray with as a Brother.

3. That there is no Humane Universal Church which hath power to Govern a *National Church*, as the Bishops may their Flocks, is proved. 1. They cannot have the Authority who have not so much as a Natural Capacity: But none have a Natural Capacity to Govern all the Christian World: *Ergo* none have such Authority.

2. They have not the *Authority* who have not the *Obligation* to use it in such Government. (For an Office containeth *Authority* and *Obligation*.) But none are obliged to Govern all the Christian World: *Ergo*, &c.

For the Minor, 1. None are obliged to Impossibilities: But, &c.

2. None are obliged without some obliging Law: But there is no Law obliging any to Govern all the Christian World: *Ergo*.

3. If they are obliged, they are condemned if they do it not: But none do Rule all the Christian World: He confesseth none have done it since the sixth General Council, that is, these thousand years (and more by one.) And doth he not Damn the Bishops of all the World then for neglecting their great Duty a thousand years together?

If he say, that Others made Canons enough before, I answer, 1. If they have had no such work to do these thousand years, then there was no Office, or Obligation or Power to do it.

2. It was then only those that made the Laws that had that Sovereignty. The Dead are no Rulers; and so the Church hath had no Sovereign since.

2. If he say, They since Ruled by the old Laws,

Answer, 1. That was not by Legislation, but Execution. 2. They never Ruled the Universal Church as one Sovereign Power by the old Laws, but only *per partes* in their several Provinces, as Justices and Mayors Rule the Kingdom, without Sovereignty.

Arg. 3. That which never was claimed till the Papal Usurpation, was not instituted by God : But a Sovereign Government of the Universal Church on Earth was never claimed till the Papal Usurpation : *Ergo*.

That Councils were only General as to one Empire, and called only in one Empire, and pretended to Govern that Empire, and not all the World, I have fully proved against *Johnson*.

Arg. 4. Those that must Rule all the Christian World, must teach them. (For the Pastoral Government is by the Word.) But no one (Person or Aristocracy) are the Teachers of all the World. Who have pretended to it but the Papacy ?

Arg. 5. If any Sovereign may Rule *England* and all other Churches as a Bishop ruleth his Flock, then that Sovereign Power, may when they judge it deserved Excommunicate the King and all the Kingdom, and silence all the Bishops and Ministers, and forbid all Church Communion (as Popes and their Councils have done.) But the consequence is false — *Ergo* —

Arg. 6. If any have such power, they must be such as people may have access to, to decide their Causes, and may hear their Accusations, Defences, Witnesses : But so cannot the Universal Church of Bishops : They confess these thousand years they met not in Council ; and whither else

should we carry our Witnesses? and where else should we expect their sentence? *Paul's charge was, 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and esteem them very highly in Love for their work sake* — But we cannot know all the Bishops over the Earth, that never were among us.

An unknown Judge cannot be obeyed : That is, One whom we cannot know to be indeed our Judge: But it's impossible for us now to know what number of Bishops, and who, must be called the Universal Judge.

And an unknown sentence cannot be obeyed; but it's impossible for us to know the sentence of the Majority of the Bishops on Earth, about any case to be judged by them these thousand years.

But enough is said of this already : And Dr. Barrow hath utterly confounded your pleas for Foreign Jurisdiction.

Pastors and Churches may Reprove one another, who Govern not one another.

And do you think we are so sottish as not to see, that your Colledge and Council must have some to call them together, or to gather Votes, and preside, and approve? And that the question will be only of the Degree of the Popes power, and whether the French sort of Popery be best?

§ 2. Dr. S. addeth, p. 343. [*So the Scripture plainly tells us elsewhere that Churches of Kingdoms and Nations have a Sovereignty over them, to which they must yield Obedience, Isa. 60. 12. where the Prophet speaking of the Christian Church saith, The Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea those Nations shall be utterly wasted. If Nations and Kingdoms must serve the Church, then*

' she hath Authority to Command their Obedience in things that belong to Peace and Holiness]

Ans. I confels *Campanella de Regno Dei* doth thus make the Papacy the Fifth Monarchy, and confidently brings many such Texts for their Clergies Universal power. But, 1. Is it the King of the Church or the People that must be obeyed? The people have no Ruling Power. And if it be the Sovereign the question is, *Who that is?* Protestants say, It is only Christ: And the Text plainly meaneth, [*The Nation that will not serve Christ the Head of the Church for the good of his Body, shall perish.*] But the Italians say, *It is the Pope and Council*, and the French, *That it is the Council and Pope* (as President and Prime Patriarch) that is here meant.

2. This may be discerned by considering, *Who it is that is to destroy such Nations*: It is Christ as the second Psalm sheweth; If it were the Pope and Council you threaten all Nations as terribly as *Bellarmino* doth.

3. And what is the *perishing* and *wasting* here meant? No doubt, their Souls that rebel against Christ shall perish, and he will also punish Bodies and Kingdoms as such. Put doth any of all this belong to the Bishops? None of it. 1. Excommunicating is their destroying work: But the Heathen and Infidel Nations are not to be Excommunicated? What have you to do to judge them that are without? Will you cast them out that never were in? 2. And destruction by the Sword is no Bishop's Work.

4. And *when* is it that all Nations that obey not shall utterly perish? We see that 19 parts in 30, with *Brierwood*, of the World are Heathens and Mahometans,

should we carry our Witnesses? and where else should we expect their sentence? *Paul's charge was, 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and esteem them very highly in Love for their work sake* — But we cannot know all the Bishops over the Earth, that never were among us.

An unknown Judge cannot be obeyed: That is, One whom we cannot know to be indeed our Judge: But it's impossible for us now to know what number of Bishops, and who, must be called the Universal Judge.

And an unknown sentence cannot be obeyed; but it's impossible for us to know the sentence of the Majority of the Bishops on Earth, about any case to be judged by them these thousand years.

But enough is said of this already: And Dr. Barrow hath utterly confounded your pleas for Foreign Jurisdiction.

Pastors and Churches may Reprove one another, who Govern not one another.

And do you think we are so sottish as not to see, that your Colledge and Council must have some to call them together, or to gather Votes, and preside, and approve? And that the question will be only of the Degree of the Popes power, and whether the French sort of Popery be best?

§ 2. Dr. S. addeth, p. 343. [*So the Scripture plainly tells us elsewhere that Churches of Kingdoms and Nations have a Sovereignty over them, to which they must yield Obedience, Isa. 60 12. where the Prophet speaking of the Christian Church saith, The Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea those Nations shall be utterly wasted. If Nations and Kingdoms must serve the Church, then*

she hath Authority to Command their Obedience in things that belong to Peace and Holiness]

Ans. I confels *Campanella de Regno Dei* doth thus make the Papacy the Fifth Monarchy, and confidently brings many such Texts for their Clergies Universal power. But, 1. Is it the King of the Church or the People that must be obeyed? The people have no Ruling Power. And if it be the Sovereign the question is, *Who that is?* Protestants say, It is only Christ: And the Text plainly meaneth, [*The Nation that will not serve Christ the Head of the Church for the good of his Body, shall perish.*] But the Italians say, *It is the Pope and Council*, and the French, *That it is the Council and Pope* (as President and Prime Patriarch) that is here meant.

2. This may be discerned by considering, *Who it is that is to destroy such Nations*: It is Christ as the second Psalm sheweth; If it were the Pope and Council you threaten all Nations as terribly as *Bellarmino* doth.

3. And what is the *perishing* and *wasting* here meant? No doubt, their Souls that rebel against Christ shall perish, and he will also punish Bodies and Kingdoms as such. Put doth any of all this belong to the Bishops? None of it. 1. Excommunicating is their destroying work: But the Heathen and Infidel Nations are not to be Excommunicated? What have you to do to judge them that are without? Will you cast them out that never were in? 2. And destruction by the Sword is no Bishop's Work.

4. And *when* is it that all Nations that obey not shall utterly perish? We see that 19 parts in 30, saith *Brierwood*, of the World are Heathens and Mahometans,

Mahometans, and yet prosper: Ever since *Abraham's* days till now the Church is a small part of the World. And it is not by any Power of the Church Governours that the Souls of Infidels *perish*, but by themselves. And their Kingdoms are unlikely to be destroyed till Christ's second coming. And if it be his destroying them at his Judgment that is meant, that proveth no Power in the Church against them.

But I confess you tell us what to fear: and whence it is that the French Protestants suffer. They must utterly *perish* that obey not a Governing Universal Sovereignty? Nay, not only French Subjects by their Lawful King, but Protestants States and Kingdoms that thought they had no Sovereign but their own proper one and Christ. But this is in *Ordine ad Spiritualia*. Yet, O you intend no Cruelty.

§. 3. *Pag 344.* He tells us of the Churches Power to decide Controversies, and of the Council, Act. 15.

Ans. A multitude of Protestant Writers have long ago answered all this. 1. The word [*Church*] is ambiguous. When Christ and his twelve Apostles were on Earth, they were the Church (as to Rule.) And then the *Universal Church* met in a House together, celebrated the Sacrament together, &c. Must they do so now? It was no *General Council that met*, Act. 15. unless you will say that there dwelt a General Council at *Jerusalem* as long as the Apostles dwelt there. None of the Bishops of the Churches planted by *Paul*, *Barnabas* and others about the World are said to be there, nor any at all but the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, save *Paul* and *Barnabas* who were sent as Messengers,

Messengers, and were not the Men sent to. And you now say, that none but Bishops have decisive Votes.

2. And there are more ways of *deciding Controversies* than one. We doubt not but every Pastor may decide them by Evidence of Scripture and Reason. And many assembled may contribute their Reasons and be helpful to each other, and may see more than one, if they be meet Men. And Pastors thus by Teaching Evidence do that as *Authorized Officers* (as Tutors and Schoolmasters) which Private Men do but as Private Men, and not as Officers: so that even their Teaching Decision is an act of Authority as well as of Skill. And so far as Humane authority must go, the concurrent Judgment of a multitude of Divines, as of Physicians, Lawyers, &c. *Ceteris paribus* deserveth more reverence than a singular opinion. But for all that, 1. An Assembly of Lay Men have no Authority but from their Evidence and Parts. 2. An Assembly of Bishops have no deciding Authority but by an office by which they are entrusted as fallible Men to teach others what they know themselves, by the same Evidence which convinced them; and to guide their particular Congregations in mutable Circumstances. 3. But an Assembly of Apostles had Power to say, *It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost*.

Obj. 1. *There were the Brethren also.* 2. *Single Apostles had the Holy Ghost, yet they did it in an Assembly.*

Ans. 1. The Inspiration or extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were then common to most Christians at least, as you may see by comparing Gal. 3. 2, 3. 1 Cor. 12. Act. 8. Rom. 8. 9, &c.

2. There

2. There were but two Messengers more than those that dwelt together, and met ordinarily. And, 1. The Apostles themselves had not such present command of the Spirit, as excluded the need of consultation. 2. And no doubt but the doubtful Christians abroad did more reverence the consent of all, than one alone. What therefore they did as consenting inspired infallible persons, will not prove a sovereignty in all the Bishops of the World in a Council, to decide Controversies by Sentence and Command. No doubt but the Assembly at *Nimeguen, Munster, Frankfurt, &c.* may decide Controversies between Princes, but not by sovereignty over each other, but by consent. To their Subjects it's revered as a consent of Princes, but to each others it's the consent of Equals. I have said that Archbishop *Usher* said to me, That Councils were but for Concord, and not for Government; the Major Vote of Bishops being no rulers of the Minor, nor of the absent.

Obj. *But all Pastors are related to the Universal Church.*

Ans. As a Licensed Physitian is related to all the Kingdom, that is, he may be Physitian to any that desire him: How strictly do the Canons forbid Usurpation in other Mens Dioceses? The English Ordainers say, *Take thou Authority to Preach the Word of God and Administer the holy Sacraments where thou shalt thereto be lawfully called.* A general Ordination maketh none a Governor of other Mens Flocks.

§. 4. Dr. S. — [*The Apostles to give Example how Controversies should be ended in future Ages, did not decide it by thyr infallible Spirit only, but*
proceed

proceed in an ordinary Method, plainly countenancing the Authority of Councils, and intimating to us, that all Christian People ought to submit to their Decrees.

Ans. 1. They did decide it by their *Infallible Spirit*; else they had not fathered all on the Holy Ghost: But not [only] by that Spirit: for it was also by their *Understandings* and their *Tongues*. Even so they did not write the Gospel *only* by the Spirit, but also by their *Reason* and their *Pens*. But they decided it not without that Spiritual infallible *Inspiration*, which your Councils have not.

You may as well say when *Act. 6. 2.* the twelve called the *Multitude*, &c. that there was a General Council, that spake not only by the Spirit: And *Act. 11. 2.* Peter pleaderth his Cause before the Apostles and Brethren, who were satisfied by his Reasons: This was such another General Council. But who doubteth but the Apostles had *Reason* as well as the *Spirit*, and used the gift of the *Spirit* in the use of *Reason*, and not only in *Extasies*: And therefore Consultation and the Spirits infallible Inspiration may go together.

2. We deny not the use of Consultation and the Consent of many as a help to incline mens Minds to Satisfaction: But only infallible Men can by infallible Authority decide Controversie sententially. And if Pope or Councils have such Infallibility, they have done ill that they would use it no better than the Multitude of their Contradictions manifesteth. And if they were infallible, the Peoples actual Faith is never the more infallible unless they themselves were infallible also. Are all the believers of Popes and Councils themselves

selves infallible, or not? If yea, then are all herein equal to the *Pope* and *Councils*. If not, then the Laity know not but they may be deceived in thinking the *Pope* and *Councils* infallible.

3. I have truly recited the doleful decision of Controversies which they have made: They have raised abundance of Controversies which have torn the Church into pieces, as I have fully proved, whether Mr. *Maurice* will or not.

4. It would have been a Service to the World indeed if *Pope* or *Councils* would to this day, after 1500 years Controversie, vouchsafe to end them, and not tell us that they are appointed to end them, and yet will not? Why are there still Cart loads of Books of Controversies among Papists, and Protestants, and all; and yet no Council doth decide them? Even the Catalogues of Heresies given us by *Ephraim*, *Philastrius*, *Augustine*, &c. are few of them medled with in your six Councils. It is the Controversies about the sense of Scripture which is most talkt of, which Councils must decide: And of the many hundred or thousand Controverted Texts, how few have Councils ever Expounded to us? How great is their guilt if they are bound to do it, and will not?

5. But you do but speak *darkness*, and no satisfaction to us, to tell us that [all Christian people ought to submit to their Decrees,] till you tell us, Whether it be to All their Decrees, or but to some, and to which, and how known.

The Case may be, I About points absolutely necessary to Salvation, or points not so necessary. II. About points plainly exprest in Scripture, or points there darkly exprest.

I. As for points absolutely necessary sober Pa-
pists themselves confess that they are all plainly
expressed in Scripture: Else it were no perfect Do-
ctrine or Law of God: If a Council contradict a-
ny Article of the Creed, must we receive its De-
crees? Sure Councils have no power to judge that
there is no God, no Christ, no Scripture, no Hea-
ven! Nor must we believe them if they should
so do: And if they have power only to tell us
that, *There is a God, a Christ, a Heaven*, Scripture
hath told us this already; and we need not that a
Council tell it us. If we believe it as of God it is
a Divine Faith; if as of Man, it is but a Humane
Faith.

2. But if it be only points not Necessary, a
Council cannot make that necessary which God
made not so? And it's a great wrong to the World,
to increase the difficulty of Faith and Salvation,
by making more necessary to it than God hath
done.

II. And whether they are necessary or not, if
they are plainly expressed in Scripture what need we
a Council to say the same again? Is not Gods
plain words intelligible, as well as theirs? And
must we not believe Gods plain words till a Coun-
cil repeat them? How many things then must we
refuse to believe, which are plainly expressed in
Scripture?

But if they be things not plainly expressed in
Scripture, it's like they are not Necessary to Sal-
vation. If they be, they are such deductions from
plain Scripture as are obvious to a sound under-
standing, or not: If yea, then every sound under-
standing may know them. Or if Men be igno-
rant, either Councils or single Pastors may teach
them:

them: But that is by opening the evidence of truth and not by commanding Men to believe it: Teaching and not Ministerial determining begetteth rational belief.

But if they are not such obvious deductions, we cannot be sure that Councils rightly collect them: But we are sure they have no power to command us believe without giving us convincing proof of the truth.

For instance, The first General (National) Council, determineth that Christ is [*God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God,*] I believe they meant the truth: But these words are so far from making me a new Article of Faith, or making the point plainer than Scripture made it, that they are to me much darker than many Scripture words. That Christ is *God*, even *One God with the Father*, and that he is the *Eternal Word*, and *Son*, the *only begotten of the Father*, the Scripture plainly tells us. And that the Person of the Son is of the Father: For the Persons being three it is meet to say that one is of the other. But *God of God*, and *Very God of Very God*, is of harder understanding, and hath tempted mistakers to say it is [*Godhead of Godhead*] as if the Essence as well as Persons were many. Creeds must be supposed to speak properly. And denominations formal are most proper: The Tritheites take advantage of this, and say, [*It is not said that the Person of the Son is of God the Father; but the Godhead as such: God of God being twice said, say they, signifieth two Gods:* They misinterpret it: But the Scripture speaketh plainlier. The same I say of [*Light of Light*] a Metaphor in a Creed. And they that put [*substantia accidentibus*] into the definition

of
tha
[/
phr
Cha
and
and
the
A
did
and
Mo
pit
fro
bou
the
fies
inc
tro
agr
cils
giv
to
wh
cil
stin
rit
fo
Co
are
V

of [*substance*] and when they have done, say that God hath no *accidents*, do not by the Word [*substance*] add any plainness to the Scripture phrase.

And how little the Council at *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon* did to end the Controversies of Prelates, and unite the Church, by setting *Constantinople* and *Rome* in mutual Jealousies and Competition, the World knows.

And what the Councils at *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* did to end the Controversies about the Nestorian and Eutychian points, or that at *C. P.* against the Monothelites, or that under *Justinian de tribus capitulis*, Mr. *Morice* and you cannot keep the World from knowing; nor yet what all the Councils about Images, some for them, and some against them, have done.

Are they the only means of ending Controversies, 1. Who do end none? 2. Who have most increased them? 3. Who are the greatest Controversie themselves? The World will never be agreed which are to be taken for General Councils Authoritative and which not; nor can you give us any thing that hath the shadow of reason to satisfy any impartial Man: And no wonder when indeed there never was an Universal Council in the VWorld.

All true Christians are agreed in all that constituteth Christianity: And it is not the Authority of Councils that made them Christians, and so agreed them. And to dream of ending all Controversies about lesser matters, as long as men are so ignorant and imperfect, as all are in this VWorld, is the part of no Man in his VVits.

§ 5. Page 345. Dr. S. ['Accordingly the Christian

*' Christian Church has challenged such an Authority, and
' has held such Assemblies as occasion did require; and
' six such have been approved and received generally in
' the Church, and no more.]*

Ans. In all this matter of fact I think there is not one true word.

1. The Christian Church did never challenge such an Authority, (unless you mean the Papal Church) as in Council to have a Legislative and Judicial Sovereignty over the whole Christian World.

2. Never such an Assembly was call'd or held, as I have fully proved.

3. The six you mean we honour, and are of the same Faith as they were, but how far all the Christian World hath been from receiving them all, I have elsewhere shewn (and so hath *Luther de Conciliis* and many Protestants.)

4. That there were no more approved and received as these were, is unproved.

§ 6. *Dr. S.* [*As for Mr. B's exception, why we do not own the second of Eph. and second of Nice for General Councils also? I answer, because they were at the time they were first held and many years after accounted no General Councils, and not received for such by the Church.— And page 346. [Mr. B. demandeth how shall any Mans Conscience be satisfied that just these six had a supream, &c. Ans. By the publick Acts of the Church as we are satisfied of our Acts of Parliament: For there are no more generally received, and these are.*

Ans. 1. I will not stand here on many previous questions: How we shall know that a Council not General binds us not as much as a General, if they have as wise Men and as strong Evidence: And

And whether any Council be General which carrieth it but by a Major Vote, where a few turn the Scales, and the rest dissent. But,

2. If there be in this decision of this great point one word that should satisfie any Mans Conscience which will not be satisfied with meer noise, or the VVriters Authority, I confesse I cannot find it.

1. Either the Decrees of the said Councils are obligatory by their Sovereignty before the diffused Church receiveth them, or not. If yea, then that obligation must be first known; yea and it is known and the Council known by those that are nearest, before all the Church on Earth can know it.

If not, then it is not the Council but the *Receiving-Church* which hath the obliging Sovereign power: And this is indeed to make Sovereign and Subjects to be the same. This is like Mr. Hooker's Principles (and many Politicians) that the Legislative Power is really in the people by Natural right, and it's no Law which hath not common consent. And if so, no Man can tell how to date your Church Laws: They did not begin to be Laws when the Council made them; but when all the Church on Earth consented: But we have need of the Decree of a General Council, (for no Dr. is sufficient) to tell us when all the Christian VVorld consenteth, for if every Christian must travel all over the VVorld to know, it will be a vagrant Church: And if he must send, he cannot be sure that his Messenger saith true: And a thousand Messengers may all differ: And who can bear their Charges? And if a Council tell us when the VVorld consenteth

to former Decrees, we must know also the worlds consent to that Decree before we can be sure it's true.

And 2. VVhether the Church diffusive give authority to the Decrees, or only be the Promulgators, whose reception must be our notice, it is a contradiction to say, [I know it first because all the World of Christians receive it.] For that's all one as to say, [*Every single Christian knoweth it because all Christians know it first.*] That is, All know it before they know it: The parts are in the whole.

3. Hath God laid the Salvation of all the Millions of Men and Women, Learned and Unlearned upon such acquaintance with Cosmography and History as to know what Councils (past 1000 years) all the Christian World receiveth? Or whether the greater part be for them or against them? Is there one of a hundred thousand that knoweth it?

It's like you will say, *They must take their Teachers, or Bishops words.* Ans. If so, those in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Germany, and all the Papists are bound to believe that you and all of your mind are Liars, for saying, There are but six such approved Councils; for their Bishops tell them of very many more. And then the Eastern Christians are bound to take you for Liars, whose Bishops tell them there were not so many. And the Protestants are bound to dissent, who generally hold that there never was one such General Council as had a Universal Jurisdiction over the Christian World. How then shall the people know what Councils as such are so received?

4. Yea it is a thing that neither you nor the most

most Learned Man can know. Were you ever in *Ethiopia*, *Syria*, *Armenia*, *Georgia*, *Circassia*, *Mengrelia*, and in all the Greek Churches? If it be Travellers that you trust to, they give you no credible notice of any such thing: And you lay our Salvation on the avoiding of Schism, and this upon our obedience to the Universal Jurisdiction, and so you lay all our Salvation on the Testimony of Travellers, who of all Men are most suspected of a liberty to Lie.

5. But the plain truth is, that notice which we have by Travellers and Historians of the mind of most of the Christian World, assureth us that a very great part of it receiveth neither your six Councils, nor your first four, and the rest receive many more; If you have read *Brocardus* and *Jacobus de Vuriaco*, who dwelt both at *Jerusalem*, and *Haitho* and others in the *Novus Orbis* that describe *Tartary* and *Armenia*, and *Leo Afer*, and *Paulus Venetus*, and *Boterus*, and *Godignus*, and *Ludolphus* of *Abassia*, &c. you may perceive how great a number of Christians there be who own not so much as your four first Councils, some abhorring that at *Ephesus*, and some that at *Chalcedon*. And you know that both Greeks and Papists receive more than six.

6. And I crave your answer to the Question which I put to your Bishop and you, How could Christians know which were the true Sovereign Councils, when the far greatest part of the Bishops disowned them? I will not censure you to be so ignorant of History as not to know that the far greatest part of the Church renounced the Council of *Chalcedon* in the Reign of divers Emperors? And the Council of *Nice* in the Reign of

Constantine and *Valens*. How then could they be known by your Rule ?

But you say, [*We may know it by the publick Acts of the Church as we know the Acts of our Parliaments.*]

Ans. I desire no better proof ; how we know them I have oft mentioned. But here you leave us utterly in the dark : What mean you here by [*the Church*] and what by [*its publick Acts* ?]

1. If by the Church you mean, 1. All Christians of this Age, we are sure they agree not of it.

2. If you mean the *Greater number*, we are incapable of gathering the Votes or knowing it : But I have shewed you that we have reason to conjecture that most are against you : Vast numbers rejecting some, and the rest receiving more, and the Protestants (nor any but the Papists that I know of) receive not any as Universal Sovereign : And the Papists also are divided about it, as *Pighius* and many more will shew you.

3. If you mean it of the most in former Ages, I still say, one Age hath had most for the Council of *Nice*, *Chalcedon*, *Constantinople* second and third, and another Age most against them.

4. If you go the only way that's left you, and with the Papists call only those *the Church* who are of your mind, unchurching the most of the Church on Earth, then I confess you may say that the Church receiveth them and only them. But few wise Men will reverence a Church so described.

II. And what the Acts of the Church are which give us such assurance as you mention, I cannot imagine : As to our Statutes I have proved a Physical

fical Evidence of the certainty of their being what they pretend ; even such a consent of Men of cross Interests and Dispositions in the compass of a Land where the fact may be known, as cannot be counterfeited or false. But about Councils the case is quite otherwise. I. The most of the Church do not so much as think that there are any such Councils, or at least never did hold it till the Papal Usurpation, that they had a Sovereignty over all the Earth.

II. They are utterly disagree'd how many and which are to be received.

III. They are disagreed which be their Canons? Even of the first at *Nice*, how long did three Popes contend about it with the African Bishops? And since *Pisanus* and *Turrian* bring us forth 80 Canons instead of 20, which the unlearned Africans receive.

IV. They are not agreed which of their Canons still bind, and which not : nor which are *de fide*, and which not : Many (as the 20th at *Nice*) are laid by without any Councils repeal.

IV. And the World is so much bigger than *Britain*, that it is not so easie to be sure of the sence of all Christians about the Matter. And how should it when it was never agreed on from the first?

If by the *Church Acts* you should mean the Decrees of later Councils, that is to prove *ignotum per ignotum*. How know we which Councils to believe when so many condemned one another? And if the Sixth was the last, there came none after to notifie the reception of it.

And whereas you say that those of *Eph. 2.* and *Nice 2d*, were when they were held, and many Years

after accounted no General Councils , nor received as such by the Church.

Answ. The Mystery lyeth in some Sectarian Notion of the Church that you have: you mean some Party; but it's hard knowing what. For, 1. *Bellarmino* himself saith, that the second Ephes. Council wanted nothing to make it as true a General Council as the rest, but the Approbation of the Pope's Legates. It was called by the Emperor, the Number greater than many others: the Consent so great, that he saith that they decreeing Heresie, *sola navicula Petri evasit*. 2. It had not only the Consent of the present Bishops as much as other Councils, but was as commonly received by the prevailing majority, while the Emperor seemed to be for that way.

2. And the second Council at *Nice* was taken for as consenting a General Council during the Reign of *Irene*, and after under the Emperors that were for Images; yea, and by the Pope himself, and all his Party in the West: But it's true that when the Emperors were against Images it was abhorred: And so one Council was for Images, and another against them; (as one for *Photinus* and another against him) by turns, for too long a time, as the Emperors were affected: But for the time, they were all called General, as that at *Nice* is by the Romans yet.

2. But if this had been true (as it is not) which you say, How shall all Christians know it to be true? When such as I with all our searching cannot know it? yea are past doubt that it is false? It's like you'll say, It is our obstinacy: And so all shall be Schismatics and condemned with you, whom you are pleased to call obstinate, for escaping that

that Ignorance which would better serve your Ends.

§. 7. Dr. S. [“ But Mr. B. objecteth, That the Nestorians, Jacobites, Abassines, &c. renounce some of the six Councils (yes, three of the six) They had a personal Veneration for the Persons of Nestorius and Dioscorus, and did believe them when they said that the Councils were mistaken in Matter of Fact, and Condemned them for Opinions, which they did not own, and thereupon did reject those Councils: But they did not then, nor do not at this day reject the Catholick Faith, and the Rules of Christian Unity, which are contained in the six General Councils. So that in effect they own them; For the principal thing required is to profess the true Faith, and hold the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace and Righteousness, which those Churches do, in that they own the Nicene, and C. P. Councils, and deny not the Doctrine of the other four.”]

Ans^r. Do you think that none of your Readers will see how much you here overthrow or give up your Cause? 1. If holding the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace and Righteousness will serve, while they renounce the Councils as erroneous and tyrannical, and holding the same Faith and Doctrine will serve, what have you been Pleading for? we are for all this as well as you? 2. And if the Council may erre in Matter of Fact, which may be known by common sence and reason, how much more may they erre in matter of right and supernatural Revelation, as the Articles of the Church of England say they have done.

3. You confess here that Men may reject three or four of your six Councils, and yet be no Schismatics,

matticks, but hold Faith, Unity and Peace. And are the other two more necessary than all the rest? You say, *They hold the two first.* *Answ.* They hold not the Infallibility of Councils, nor that they may not be rejected when they erre, nor that we may not be discerning Judges when they erre: For all this is renounced in their renouncing all save two or three.

4. You say, *They reject not the Rules of Christian Unity.* *Answ.* Therefore they judged not the Decrees of Councils to be that necessary Rule: Else the Decrees of those renounced by them would be as necessary as the rest.

5. It's apparent by this that they held the same with those Councils, not because of the Authority of those Councils, but on other Grounds: For it is not possible that they who renounced the Councils, should believe the Christian Faith, on their Authority. They believed it as a Divine Revelation *sic Divina*, and so do we.

6. And dare you say that a Man that believeth the same things because they are revealed by God in his Word, shall be damned unless he believe them *sic humana*, because a General Council decreed them.

7. Did your other Councils add any Decrees to the first? If not, what need of believing any thing as theirs? If yea, then receiving the Decrees of the two first is not a receiving the Decrees of the later.

8. And on whose Authority did Christians believe the first 300 years before there was any General Council?

§. 8. Dr. S. P. 346. [*“ Obj. Did the Catholick Church die or cease after the sixth General Council?*

“ Answ.

"Answ. The Essence of the Catholick Church doth
 "not consist in the being of a Council.—Their meeting
 "is but an external means for better declaring the Ca-
 "tholick Faith, and holding mutual Correspondence
 "between the several Churches.

Ans. 1. Still you are constrained to destroy your
 own Cause. You confess then that Councils are no
 constitutive Governing part of the Church as a Go-
 verned Society. And if so, it hath some other Hu-
 mane constitutive Regent part, or none. If none,
 we are so far agreed : This is it that we contend
 for. If any other, you must come to your Lords
 College of the diffused Pastors ; who never made
 Law, never heard a Cause, or judged out of Coun-
 cil, to this day, nor possibly can do.

2. What is this that you call an *external means*
of Correspondence ? Is it a *necessary Supream Legisla-*
tive and Judicial Power ? or not ? If it be, it must
 be a constitutive Essential part of the Church as
 Political. For every Politick Society is informed
 by such. And you argued before that Nations
 must be under such as well as Dioceses under Dio-
 cesans. If not, *habetur quasitum*.

3. And because your former words assert an
Universal Sovereignty, I wonder how any of com-
 mon reason can think this necessary to the whole
 Christian World, during the few Years that those
 two or six first Councils sate, and never before nor
 after ? Are dead Men our Governors ? Will a
Power of Governing never exercised serve for a
 Thousand Years last, and 300 before, and not for
 the other 300 ? Or hath the Church had one
 Form of Government for 200 or 300 Years, and
 another for all the other 1300 ? And when you
 tell us that Kingdoms must be judged as well as
 single

single Persons, did those first Councils judge all the sinning Kingdoms since. If you own no Councils since the first Six, all Kingdoms that have sinned these 1000 Years had no such Judges. And what Councils or other Church Power save the Popes, judg'd the many Southern and Eastern Countries that revolted? Or the Western Nations in their various Changes and Crimes? Must we have such an Universal Judge now, who never judged any these 1000 Years.

4. Your Lord saith at last that they are *Mutable Laws* which Councils make. If so, why must we needs obey the six Councils that were 1000 Years ago, under another Prince? May not 1000 Years time, and another King's Government make a Change in the Matter and Reason of the Law? If you say, it stands till another General Council change it; I answer, 1. What Council abrogated the 20th *Nicene* Canon against Kneeling on the Lord's Day in adoration? and many such other. 2. Then if ever there was a General Council it's Decrees are immutable (and so you contradict your selves) For it's certain there never will be a General Council to abrogate what is done, till all the World be under one Christian Monarch.

5. The Laws of *England* bind us not now as the Laws of the Kings and Parliaments that are dead; that is, not by Virtue of their Authority (though made by them) But as the Laws of the present Legislative Powers who own them and rule by them, and can abrogate them when they will. And when the Canon-makers are dead 1000 Years ago, where now is the Ruling Power whose Laws those are? There is no General Council to

OWN

own them, nor ever will be ! A thousand Years sure is time enough to prove the death of a Power never since exercised : were there a Seminal Virtue of Universal Regiment in the diffused Church, a Thousand Years Sleep in reason must pass for a Death.

6. Yea, the diffusive Church hath since disowned the Universal Obligation of those same Councils, and doth disown them to this day. For it is not near half the Christian VWorld that own them ; yea, none but Papists that I could ever be certified of do receive any such Councils at all, as Legislators and Judges to all the Christian World ; but only as Reverenced Rules of Concord made by Contract And if *Constantine, Theodosius, Martian, &c.* called their Subjects to Councils 1000 Years ago, why is our King and Kingdom now any more subject to the Subjects of those Emperors than to them?

But if you were content to endure us to unite in Christ, and take his Laws for our Rule and bond of Peace, and stay till the next General Council, be against us, we desire no more.

§. 9. P. 347. Mr. B. saith, [“ *It is a doleful thing to think on what account all these Men expect that all Christians Consciences can be satisfied, &c.*”] D. S. answereth, [“ *It is a doleful thing indeed to think how they should be satisfied that set up a Pope in every Congregation, and follow him in opposition to the Catholick Church and General Councils.—*”] “ *Mr. B. knows he does this, and deludes the poor People, &c.*”

Ans. 1. If I know it, methinks I should know that I know it. Which if I do, it's I that am the Impudent Liar : If not—Somebody is mistaken.

Qu. Whether a Council of such Bishops be infallible, or can make us a better Rule than the Scripture.

2. Readers, here you see that it is no wonder that these Reverend Fathers renounce Popery. You see what a Pope is in their account: It is a Minister of a single Church, who taketh not their Lordships or Councils to be Law-givers and Judges over all the Earth. We poor Protestants took him for a Pope that claimed such an Universal Rule alone, or as the President of Councils: But these Men take him for a Pope that denieth Popery, and pretendeth to no Government beyond his Parish. Yea, not only so, but in our Parishes we oblige none to take up any of their Religion (Faith or Duty to God) on our commanding Authority, but to learn by the Evidence which caused our own Faith, to believe by a Faith Divine.

3. I have oft said that the Catholick Church is such by Faith and Subjection to Christ, which I own and daily Preach: But that there never was a General Council of the Christian World, nor is there any such thing as a Catholick Church in the Popish sence, that is, having one Political humane Sovereignty. And how did the Man make himself believe that I knowingly opposed that which my whole Writing labours to prove never had a being. Reader, Lament the Case of the Church on Earth, when the most studious Leaders are so dark and rash and bad, as either I, or these Reverend Fathers are, setting the World into ruining Divisions by words of such a Dialect as is harsh to name.

§. 10. P. 348. Dr. S. pretendeth to some Scripture Proofs, viz: 1 Cor. 14. 32, 33. *The Spirit of*

the P
not th
Chur

the v
verai

1. T
order
they
them
Diso
do in
from
to re
make
ready
Wor

2.
eth o
himf
Spiri
confi
Cou

3.
phet
and
sent
than

§.
Opp
yet
to w
for,
that
rhor

the

the Prophets are subject to the Prophets. For God is not the Author of Confusion, but of Peace, as in all the Churches of the Saints.]

Answ. Reader, Do you think this proveth that the whole Church on Earth is under one humane Sovereignty that hath a Legislative and Judging Power.

1. This Text speaketh only of the avoiding Disorder in particular Assemblies by the means which they had present there among them. To keep them from speaking two at once, and such like Disorders : As the *Archi-Synagogoi* were used to do in the Jews Synagogue. And must a Council from all the Earth be gathered to that Assembly to rebuke such Disorder ? If it must be but to make a General Law to forbid it, that's done already in Scripture and in Nature : And must the World meet to do it again ?

2. Their Dr. *Hamond* saith, that this Text speaketh of the Spirit in each Prophet being subject to himself, that is, to his own reason, and that the Spirit moveth them not to speak irregularly and confusedly : And what's this to the Power of Councils ?

3. If it were spoken of the other present Prophets, what's this to Men that are no Prophets, and that are dead 1000 Years ago ? Are not present Pastors fitter Moderators of their Assembly, than a General Council of dead Men ?

§. 11. Next he that so condemneth me as an Opposite, citeth my words as granting his Cause ; yet this reconcileth him not : I am not so idle as to write him a Commentary of my own words ; for, I can devise no plainer. Only I may tell him that he too quickly forgot that *God is not the Author of Confusion* : and therefore it is not lovely :

A *Law* should not be confounded with a *Contract* or amicable *Agreement* ; nor a *Sovereign Government* with a *Peace-making Assembly* of Equals ; nor a possible *Council* of those within reach with an impossible *Council* out of all the *World*. Neither the King of *France* or of *England* were Subjects to the Assembly at *Nimeguen*.

§. 12. P. 351. He saith, he could give numberless Quotations of Protestants, *Melanchthon*, *Bucer*, *Calvin*, *Bishop Andrews*, *K. James*, *Spalatenfis*, *Casaubon*, *Bishop White*, *Bishop Mountagne*, *Archbishop Dr. Hamond*, *Dailee*, &c.

Ans. I cannot answer what you can do, but what you do. But the Reader may know how far to believe you, that will but search these few.
1. Read what I have cited out of *Melanchthon* to *Bishop Guning*, or rather his own Epistle of the Conference at *Ratisbone*, and that to King *Henry* the 8th.

2. Read *Bucer de Regno Dei*, and the rest of his *Opera Angl.* and judge as you see cause.

3. I am ashamed to cite any words of *Calvin*, to confute our Drs. intimation.

4. Whether *Spalatenfis* was a Protestant I dispute not, but read his own words cited by me in my Treatise of Episcopacy, and then read him of Councils, and judge.

5. *Bishop Usher*, as I have oft said, told me himself, That [Councils are not for Government of the absent or the particular Bishops, but for Concord.]

What Mind *Dr. Hamond* was of I determine not : But of the rest you may judge by these.

The Matter is, All Protestants hold that we must Serve God in as much Concord as we can:
And

And that the Meeting of Pastors is a means of Concord : And that it was the true Christian Faith which the Councils which he nameth owned; and we are of the same Faith : and therefore they reverence these Councils : And they hold that still Concord being much of the Strength and Beauty of the Churches, when there is any special reason for it, (as several Princes assemble by themselves or Messengers at *Munster, Ratisbone, Franksfort, Nimeguen*) so Pastors even of several Kingdoms, not too distant, may for mutual help and Concord meet in Councils : And none should needlessly break their just Agreements, because of the general Command of Concord : But 1. They hold that these Councils be no representers of all the Christian World ; 2. Nor have any Universal Jurisdiction. 3. Nor any true Governing Power at all over the absent or dissenters, but an Agreeing Power. 4. And if they pretend any such Power, they turn Usurpers. 5. And if on pretence of Concord they make Snares, or Decree things that are against the Churches Edification, Peace or Order, or against the Word of God, none are bound to stand to such Agreements.

These being the Judgment of Protestants, what do these Men but abuse their words of Reverence to Councils, and Submission to their Contracts, as if they were for their Universal Sovereign Jurisdiction?

§. 13. And next he saith, [*Whereas Mr. B. doth usher in his Discourse with an intimation that this was only a Doctrine of the Gallican Church, he cannot but know that this was the sense of the Church of England in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths Reign.*]

Answ. 1. I honour the Gallican Papists above the Italian; but I am satisfied that both do erre.

2. There is a double untruth in Matter of Fact in your words: 1. That I *cannot but know* that which I *cannot know* or believe. 2. That yours was the sence of the Church of *England*: which I have disproved. But what is your proof?

D. S. [For the 20th Article saith, [*"The Church hath Power to Decree Rites and Ceremonies and Authority in Controversies of Faith, and the next Article doth suppose this Authority in General Councils.*

Answ. The Church of *England* supposeth that Kingdoms should be Christian, and the Magistrates and Pastors Power so twisted as that their Conjunction may best make Religion national, (as it was with the Jews) But it never owned a foreign Jurisdiction, or the Governing Power of the Subjects of one Kingdom over the Princes and People of another. It followeth not that because the Church in *England* may Decree some Rites here, that therefore foreign Churches may command us to use their Rites. Our own Church Teachers no doubt have Authority in Controversies of Faith; that is, to teach us what is the truth, and to keep Peace among Disputers, but not to bind us to believe any thing against God's Word, and therefore not meerly because it's their Decree: Therefore the Article cautelously calls the Church only [*a Witness and Keeper of holy Writ*] which we deny not. And that [*besides Scripture they ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for Necessity to Salvation.*] But you would have us believe the Sovereign Universal Jurisdiction of Councils, yea and the lawfulness of all your Oaths

and
ing
vat
2
tha
cite
Im
and
Pow
wit
syll
the
may
men
Go
Co
Kin
Ind
a C
are
Spin
hav
the
to l
and
Jud
dair
Str
the
eve
you
tho
tur
con
cei

and Impositions, as necessary to escape damning Schism; and is not that as necessary to Salvation?

2. And one would think there needed no more than the next Articles to confute you, which you cite as for you. They knew that there had been Imperial General Councils, which being gathered and authorized by the Emperors, had the same Power in the Empire that National Councils have with us, or in other Nations. But there's not a syllable of any Jurisdiction that they have out of the Empire: Yea, contrary it's said, 1. That *they may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes*: And therefore cannot Govern them without their Will, nor have any Conciliar Power, being no Council: And one King cannot command the Subjects of another. Indeed if Princes will *make themselves* Subjects to a Council or Pope, who can hinder them? 2. They are here declared to be *Men not all governed by the Spirit and Word of God, and such as may erre and have erred in things pertaining to God*. Therefore their meer Contracts and Advice are no further to be obeyed than they are governed by the Spirit and Word of God; which we are discerning Judges of. And it is concluded that [*things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of the Holy Scripture.*] So that even their *Expositions of the Articles of Faith*, which you make their chief Work, hath no further Authority than it's declared to be taken out of the Scripture it self, nor yet their decision of the sence of controverted Texts. And such proof must be received from a single Man.

§. 14. Such another proof he fetcheth from the Statute 1 Eliz. c. 1. "*Forbidding to judge any thing Heretic but what hath been so judged by Authority of Canonical Scripture, or the first four General Councils, or any of them, or any other General Councils.*"]

Ans. As if forbidding private Heretication were the same with the Universal Sovereignty of Councils; we are of the same Religion with all true Christians in the World, and we are for as much Concord with all as we can attain: But is Concord and Subjection all one, or Contract and Government.

§. 15. The like Inference he raiseth from a Canon 1571. forbidding any new Doctrine *not agreeable to the Scripture, and such as the Ancient Fathers and Bishops thence gathered.*

Ans. And what's this to an Universal Church Sovereignty?

§. 16. The Church of England's Sence is better expounded, *Reform. Leg. Eccles. c. 15.* "*Orthodoxorum Patrum etiam auctoritatem minime censemus esse contemnendam: sunt enim per multa ab illis præclare & utiliter dicta: Ut tamē ex eorum sententia de sacris literis judicetur, non admittimus. Debent enim sacræ literæ nobis omnis Christianæ doctrinæ, & Regulæ esse, & Judices. Quin & ipsi Patres tantum sibi deferri recusarunt, sæpius admonentes Lectorem, ut tantisper suas admittat sententias & interpretationes, quoad cum sacris literis consentire eas animadverterit.*

§. 17. D. S. P. 358. [Mr. B. saith, *The doubt is whom you will take for good Christians into your Communion, But this can be no doubt,—when I ex-*

cept only the Jesuited part of the Roman and other Churches.

Ans. So you take in the Church of Rome, which you cannot do without taking in the pretended Sovereignty Essential to it. Was not that Church Papal before there were any Jesuites? But hold, Dr. It's *France* that you are first Uniting with: and they say, that the Jesuites are there the Predominant part. And are you against them there?

§. 18. P. 360. He takes it ill that I suppose him to separate from the Church of *England*, I have fully given him here my proof. The Church of *England* took not it self for a part of an Universal humane Political Church. But his Church doth, and is thereby of another Political Species, as a City differeth from a Kingdom.

I will not tire the Reader with following him any further. Vain Contenders necessitate us to be over tedious.

§. 19. I am loth here to answer the rest of his Book against our Nonconformity; 1. Because I would not follow them that decoy, and divert Men from the state of our chief Controversie, to hide their Design. 2. Because it seemeth to me to be of no use: He that will not read impartially what we say as well as they, will never be cured of his Errours by any thing that we can write. And he that will impartially read but my first Plea for Peace, Apology, and Treatise of Episcopacy, and take this Book to be a Satisfactory answer, shall never be troubled by my Replies, no more than the distracted.

§. 20. This much I shall presume to say, lest he expect some account of his Success upon my self:

I. That when he tells the Reader at last of my Concessions, as if I scarce differed from them, save by not giving over Preaching when forbidden, they do but shew how charitable and humble they are in their Domination, who yet can hardly suffer such Men alive out of Jail, much less to preach, who come so near them.

II. That when he tells us that the Presbyterian Cause is given up, and yet their Party make the name of Presbyterian (odious to them but not to us) the Engine of their reproachful malice, this seemeth not to me to come from the Spirit of Christ.

III. That when this whole Book pretendeth to confute us, and scarce once that I find in all the Book, truly stateth the case of our difference, but still silenceth or falsly representeth the points which we judge sin, yea heinous sin ; such a Deceiving Volume seemeth not to me to beseem a Bishop, or his Amanuensis, or Chaplain.

IV. That when he tells us what pitiful proof he hath for the justification of their Silencing and Ruining ways, and yet how extream confident he is, it maketh me with Christians to pray yet harder that Christ would save his Church from such Bishops.

I will now stay but to instance in that which they say the Bishop hath some peculiarity in, *viz.* *Our Assent* to the Rubrick about the Salvation of dying Baptized Infants. Reader, I have reason to believe that it is the Bishop as well as Dr. *Saywell* that speaketh to me. And 1. He dealeth more ingenuously than they that on pretence of [*Assenting to the use*] say that we are not to *Assent to the Truth* of this as a Doctrine of Religion:

gion: He professeth the contrary, and that Assent to this is required as well as to the *Catechism*.

2. He seeketh not their Evasion that make not the phrase *Universal*, but *Indefinite*: For he knew,

1. That *in re necessaria* (which he takes this to be) an Indefinite is equal to an Universal: And

2. That a *quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*: And the assertion is of Infants *quâ Baptized*.

3. It is a certainty mentioned by Tautology that must be by every Minister professed, [*It is certain by the Word of God that they are undoubtedly saved.*] Here we ask them two things, or three.

1. Whether none should be a Minister of Christ who cannot truly profess this *undoubted Certainty*. 2. Whether almost all the Learned Writers and Ministers of the Reformed Churches should be Silenced that hold the contrary. 3. But specially *what be the words of God* here meant which express this *undoubted certainty*? They confess that God saith, *Deut. 12. 32. Thou shalt not add thereto, nor take ought therefrom*; and concludeth the Bible with, [*If any Man add to these things, God shall add to him the Plagues that are written in this Book.*] We tell them we dare not venture on such a dreadful Curse: This cannot be one of their *things indifferent*: Therefore before we profess our Assent that *this is undoubtedly certain by the Word of God*, they will shew us so much compassion as to tell us, where to find that Word of God? And after all our intreaty (even my own to the Bishop) he giveth us by his Chaplain but this one Text of Scripture, *Gal. 3. 27. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*] Reader, is here one word of the certain undoubted Salvation of *dying baptized Infants* without exception?

1. Here is no mention of baptizing Infants; and it's usual with this sort of Men to say, That we cannot prove Infant Baptism by Scripture, but only by Tradition or the authority of the Church.

2. This Text most certainly speaketh of the Adult: And will not these Drs. believe St. Peter himself who told Simon when he was Baptized, *Thou hast no part nor lot in this matter: For thy heart is not right in the sight of God; Thou art yet in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity?* If they say that Simon had been saved if he had died as soon as he was Baptized, and that he fell to that false Heart, and gall of bitterness after, who will take such Drs words in despite of the evident truth? His Friend Grotius more modestly expoundeth Gal. 3. 27. *Sicut à baptismo vestes sumuntur, ita vos Promissistis vos induturos Christum, id est victuros secundum Christi regulam.* Do these Men believe that all Infidels and Hypocrites shall be saved if they die as soon as they are Baptized? Or do they think that none such may be and are, Baptized? The very words before the Text are, *Ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus:* And Christ saith, *He that believeth and is Baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.* And yet they bring us no Text for their new Article of Faith, but one which will as much prove the Salvation of all dying baptized Hypocrites and Unbelievers, as of all dying Infants. As if none came in without the Wedding Garment, or such were in a state of Life.

I must profess that I cannot see should I subscribe this, how I could escape the guilt of Heresie, being liable to the foresaid Curse and Plagues

of adding to the Word of God, by saying that Gods Word speaketh this certain and undoubted Salvation of dying Baptized Infants as such without Exception. Yet if we would all conform to all their Oaths, Covenants and Impositions besides, we must all be cast out and forbid to preach the Gospel, if we durst not Assent to this one Article. Such is the mercy of these Men! And all is justified as for sound Doctrine, which we are ignorant of, and these Masters are the Judges whom we must believe.

Yet note that though when he got the Church of England to pass this Article, he put not in the least Exception, and the Canon forbids the refusing Baptism to any *Child that is offered to it*, yet now he limits it to *all Children seriously offered by any that have power to educate them in that profession*. And as it is not the Parent that must be the Promiser; nor is suffered to be so much as one of the Godfathers or Sureties for his Child, so by this little limitation, what a dreadful brand of perfidious Covenanting with God, doth he fix on our common English Baptism? For sure it is not the confident talk of such Writers that makes any English Man ignorant, 1. That our Godfathers commonly are not once desired by the Parents to *Educate their Children in that Profession*. 2. Nor ever give them the least reason to expect it. 3. Nor ever perform it. 4. Nor have any power so to Educate them, because the Parents never purposed so far to commit their Children to them, nor they themselves never dream of any such power or undertaking; except only such as adopt a Child, or take an Orphan or Grand-child as their own. I have lived almost sixty seven years,

(now

(now near seventy four) and never knew one Godfather Educate the Child, (save the Parent that is forbidden to be Godfather) or that it was ever expected from him by the Parents. It seems the Poor never came to Bishop *Guning* as they have done to me, to beg Money to pay the Curate and Clerk, and to hire some poor Man to be Godfather, or else their Children cannot be Baptized: So that he that can get but Twelve pence a day by hard labour, may get on the *Sunday* Twelve pence for standing an hour at the Font as Godfather, and perhaps half a Crown; and so it's become a Trade, of such as never mean to see the Child again. Though none but the poor thus hire Promisers, yet the Nation commonly never give them power to *Educate* their Children. And thus while the Bishop first must force us to profess the certain undoubted Salvation of dying Baptized Infants without exception he comes himself with an exception which shuts out all that ever I knew conformably Baptized in all my Life; and maketh the common Baptism of the Land to be perfidiousness: The Anabaptists will not be converted by such Doctors.

And it's known how much these Men are for tying us to *deliver no Doctrine from any Text but what the Fathers have thence gathered*: And *Augustine de Baptis. Cont. Donat. li. 1. c. 11, 12.* at large expoundeth this single Text of the Dr. by *Simon's* case, and supposing the Donatists to say that *Simon* was pardoned in Baptism and lost it by his next sin, he saith, *c. 12.* [*Quid si ad ipsum baptismum factus accessit? Dimissa sunt ei peccata, an non sunt dimissa? Eligant quod volunt — si dimissa dixerint, quomodo ergo spiritus sanctus disciplina effu-*
gerit

gerit fictum? Si in isto ficto remissionem operatus est peccatorum? — fateantur vero baptismo Christi baptizari posse hominem, & tamen cor ejus in malitia vel Sacrilegio perseverans peccatorum abolitionem non finire fieri. Atq; ita intelligant in communionibus ab Ecclesia separatis posse homines baptizari, ubi Christi baptismus eadem Sacramenti celebratione datur & sumitur, qui tamen tunc profit ad remissionem peccatorum cum quis reconciliatus unitati, sacrilegio diffensionis exuitur quo ejus peccata tenebantur, & dimitti non sinebantur. Sicut enim in illo qui fictus accesserit, sic ut non denuo baptizetur, sed ipsa pia correctione & veraci confessione purgetur, quod non posset sine baptismo, ut quod ante datum est, tunc valere incipiat ad salutem, cum illa fictio veraci confessione recesserit —

Thus Gods Word must by ten thousand Ministers be said to affirm that certainly and undoubtedly, which he brings but one Text for grossly abused, contrary to the Doctrine even of *Augustine* who laid too much on Baptism, and contrary to the very Law of Christ, which saith, *He that believeth not shall be damned*, not excepting the Baptized, *Mark 16. 16.*

Obj. But yet all Baptized Infants may be saved?

Ans. The question now is, Whether that Text *Gal. 3. 27.* prove it, or any Word of God.

He must be supposed to know that there are many Opinions among the most Learned Divines about the Case of Baptized Infants Salvation, (ten I have elsewhere named.) And must every Minister in *England* determine which of all these is right, because it's *Dr. Gunning's* Opinion?

Many Nonconformists hold that the Covenant of Grace, doth certainly put all true Christians Infants into a state of Pardon and Salvation, (calling them

them Holy) which is to be openly done by Baptismal Investiture. But that the Children of all the Atheists, Infidels, Idolaters, or wicked men on Earth are in such a state, and certainly saved so dying, if any Christian will but stand as in *England* as Godfather, and if a Band of Soldiers can but take up thousands of them, and so Baptize them, and that the Salvation of them is undoubtedly certain by Gods Word, to every one that must be tolerated to be a Minister; this is our present way of Church Concord, but not Christs way.

And if all the Infants on Earth have right to Salvation if they can but be Baptized, why should they not have it Unbaptized, when it is none of their fault it being not in their power? It is his own argument when we question the *undoubted certainty* affirmed, p. 162. [*To say the unworthiness or the sin of the Godfather or Pather can deprive the Baptized Child of the benefit of Gods Ordinance, is a monstrous Opinion.*] And whose sin is it but the Fathers that depriveth all Infidels Children of Baptism, and so of the benefit of it? Will all *England* believe that God layeth the Saving or Damning of Millions upon the bare act of outward Baptism, while the Children have equal antecedent right?

The Bishop and his Chaplain Dr. refer me to Mr. *Dodwell* for part of my answer: And Mr. *Dodwell* is so much of the Bishops mind, that I may suppose the Bishop to be much of Mr. *D*'s mind. I will urge him therefore *ad hominem* with one argument from Mr. *D.* against Conformity; let him answer it without condemning Mr. *D.* if he can.

In Sacramental Investitures no Man receiveth more right than what the Investor intendeth to give him, or at least not that which he declareth that he doth not give him. But multitudes of Baptizing Ministers in *England* and all the Reformed Churches declare that they intend not to give by Paptifmal Investiture a present right to Salvation to all Baptized Infants, (if they so die.) *Ergo* all Baptized Infants receive not by Baptism a present right to Salvation.

The Major is Mr. *D's* about Ordination. The Minor is notorious in the known Writings and Doctrines of such Ministers ; some holding that only the Children of true Christians are by Baptism stated in a certain right to Salvation ; some holding it only of the Elect ; some holding it only of professed Christians Children ; and almost all denying it of the Children of Atheists and Infidels. When Dr. *Cornelius Burges* did but write that all the Elect, though they lived wickedly after till Conversion, received a Seed of Regeneration in their Infant Baptism, what abundance of Dissenters, yea how few Consenters did he find in *England* ? When yet he affirmed this of none but such as are after saved.

And if for want of the Baptizers Intention, thousands in *England* have no right to Salvation presently on their Baptism, then it is not lawful to say that the contrary is undoubtedly certain by the Word of God.

But I confess Mr. *D's* Proposition is false, as I have formerly proved to him. And perhaps necessity will force himself to deny it as to Baptism, though it overthrow his assertion about Ordination. Specially if he be for Laymen and Women

mens Baptizing as the Papists are in case of danger.

But the Name of the *Church* will warrant such Lords to prove all such Declarations, Subscriptions, Oaths, not only sinless, but necessary to Order, Peace, Obedience, Ministry, and I think to Salvation: For they make Schism Damning, and such Obedience necessary to escape Schism.

But he hath one cleanly shift, Though the Corporation Declaration, be, that [*there is no Obligation from the Covenant on me or any other person,*] and a Man think that some are obliged by it against *Schism, Popery and Prophaneness*, and to *repent of Sin.*] He saith no Man is forced to take these Declarations, Vestry Oaths, &c. For he may chuse, and none constraineth him to be in Corporation trust, or a Vestry-man, and so a Minister, so the Act was to appropriate this sweet Morfel of so Swearing declaring, &c. to themselves: And to themselves let it be appropriated for me. And yet when all the Corporations, Vestries and Ministry are constituted as they are, — this is the necessary Unity—

But Obedience to the Church solveth all. I once askt a Convocation man, what were the Words of God by which this Article was proved and past in the Convocation, and he could not name me any Text that perswaded the Convocation to pass it; but told me Dr. P. Guning urged it so hard, that they yielded to him without much contradiction: I was not willing to believe that the Church of *England* would pass an Article of Faith against their Judgments to avoid striving with one man, when in imposing it they must strive against and silence thousands, and condemn most of the

Reformed

Reformed Churches ; but rather that really they contradicted him not, because they thought as he : And yet I was loth to think them so uncharitable as to put all Ministers to declare such a thing to be in the Word of God, and never tell them where to find it. Between both what to think I know not : But if really Dr. G. was the Church, the reverence of his Name [*Church*] shall never make me add to the Word of God, or corrupt his Ordinance ; nor subscribe to his Book, or to a Foreign Jurisdiction, if he Father it on the Church.

The main strength of all his condemnations of us, and justifications of himself is, that, *They are the Church, and our lawful Rulers, and we must obey, and be sworn never to endeavour any alteration of Church Government,* (not excepting Church depopulation by large Dioceses, nor the use of the Keys by Lay Chancellors. And if you ask for the proof of all this, and that they are not *Usurpers* nor *Church-destroyers*, nor *Subverters of Episcopacy* it self, nor grand Schismatics, you must be content with, 1. *Ipse dixit*, and 2. *Episcopacy is ancient*. 3. *And the people have neither an Electing or necessary Consenting Vote ;* and yet when not only Mr. Clerkson and I, but also Dr. Burnet have fully proved that for twelve hundred or thirteen hundred years the peoples Consent was requisite, these great dependents on Antiquity and the Church, can wash all off with a torrent of words.

If the Letters in the *Caballa* and other History be credible, how great a hand had G. Duke of *Buckingham* in making the Church of *England* in his days ? Read but what *Heylin* saith of
Bishop

Bishop *Laud's* preferment; and the Letters of some Bishops to *Buckingham* in the *Caballa*, and judge what made the Church of *England*: How basely do they sneak and beg of him for Preferment? e. g. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Llandaffe*, is a most miserable Man if his Grace help him not to a better Bishoprick: *Mountagues* place at *Normich* was of little worth since *Henry* the Eighth stole the Sheep, and scarce for God's sake gave the trotters, as he saith in his Letter to *Laud*. And this was the way. So the Church of *England* is *Jure Divino* made by the Civil Powers: But yet a few words can prove (just as he proveth all the rest) that the Dean and Chapter chuse the Bishops and not the King. As Heathens made Images of the Gods and thought the Gods did actuate them, so men make the Images of Bishops and Councils, and some Spirits actuate them, whatever they be, whether those Noble Lords, Knights and Gentlemen that at their death lamented that they lived Atheists and Infidels, repented that as Patrons they chose Parish Church men I know not. But while these Drs know that many Great Councils have decreed the nullity of those Bishops that got in by Secular help and favour, and Damned the Seekers and Accepters of it; and yet would perswade the Church that all Gods Word is insufficient for Universal Laws without the addition of Sovereign Councils, I will regard them as they deserve, and not as they expect. Why answer they not my late Book of English Nonconformity?

The True Sum.

Popery is. I. The turning a National Universalty or Catholicism of Councils, Church, Power,
into

into a Terrestrial Universality. II. Turning Confederacy and Communion into Political Regency. III. Deponing Kings and States from their Sacred office of Supream Government (and sole forcible Government) of the Church or Persons and things Ecclesiastical, (the Clergy having only the Power of the Keys, Word and Sacraments to work on Conscience without corporal face.)

Chap. XV. *The first Letter to Bishop Peter Guning, upon his sending me Dr. Saywell's Book.*

My Lord,

I Thankfully received from you by Dr. Crowther Dr. Saywell's Book, and a motion for Conference with him, which I yet more thankfully accept; I read over the Book presently, and think it meet to give you this account of the Success:

I. 1. I perceive that it doth not concern me, nor many, if any, that I converse with; For it is Presbyterians, Separatists, Quakers and Fanatics that he accuseth, and I am conversant with few such.

2. And yet the strein of his Book is such, as will make Readers undoubtedly think, that by Presbyterians and Nonconformists, or Conventiclers, he meaneth the same Persons, and speaketh of the common Case of the present ejected silenced Ministers: Of whom I must again and again say, 1. That I have had opportunity by Acquaintance and Report of knowing a great part of the silenced Ministers of *England*, and I know but of
N few

few of them that are Presbyterians; and Judge most of them to be Episcopal; Lawyers and Gentlemen indeed incline to place all the Government in the King and Magistrates. 2. That in 1661. when we were Commissioned to endeavour Concord with you, not only those named in the Commission, but all the Ministers of *London* were invited by Mr. *Calamy*. and Dr. *Reinolds*, and Mr. *Abbot* and Dr. *Wallis*, &c. to come to us in Consultation, and let us know their Sense: and many came. And I remember not one Man that dissented from what we offered you first, which was Archbishop *Usher's* Primitive Form, which took not down Archbishops, Bishops, or a farthing of their Estates, or any of their Lordships or Parliamentary Power or Honour, (unless the Advice of their Presbyters, and the taking the Church Keys out of the hands of Lay Chancellors cast you down.) 3. That when the King's Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs 1660. granted yet much less Power to Presbyters, and left it almost alone in the Bishops, we did not only acquiesce in this, but all the *London* Ministers were invited to meet to give the King our joyful Thanks for it: And of all that met, I remember but two (now both dead) who refused to subscribe the Common Thanksgiving (which with many Hands is yet to be seen in Print). And those two express their Thankfulness; but only said [That because some things agreed not to their Judgments, they durst not so subscribe, lest it signified Approbation; but they should thankfully accept that Frame, and peaceably submit to it.]

All this being so, I appeal (with some sense of the Case of *England*) to your self and common reason,

reason, whether it be just and befeeming a Pastor
or Christian, or a Man to make the Nation believe,

1. That we are Presbyterians, 2. And against Bi-
shops) 3. And therefore that we are Schismaticks.

4. And therefore that we must be Imprisoned or
Banished, as those that would destroy the Church
and Land. Would a Turk own such dealing with
his Neighbour? Is this the way of Peace? Will
this bring us to Conformity? Was it Anti-Epis-
copal Presbytery which the King's *Declaration* 1660
determined of? Nothing will Serve God, and
the Churches Peace, but Truth and Honesty,
or at least that which hath some appearance
of it.

II. I find that almost all the Strength of his
Book as against Presbyterians (who are his Fana-
tickes) is his *bare word*, saying that they are *Schif-*
maticks, and that they forsake the Judgment and
Practice of the Universal Church by forsaking
Episcopacy. And will this convince me, who
am certain, that I am for that Episcopacy which
Ignatius, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c. were for, and am
past doubt that the Episcopacy which I am against
is contrary to the Practice of the whole Church
for 200 Years, and of all save two Cities (*Alex-*
andria and *Rome*) for a much longer time; If I
prove this true (which I undertake) must I then
take his turn, and desire the Banishment of the
Contrary-minded Bishops, as dangerous Schif-
maticks for forsaking the Practice of the
Church?

III. I understand not in his Platform of the
Rule which denominateth Dissenters Schismaticks,
Pag. 353. what he meaneth by the very *highest*
Power, most necessary to be understood in these

words [*The Laws and Orders of the Church Universal*] to which every Provincial Church must submit.] What the Scots mean by [a General Assembly] I know, and what the old Emperors and Councils meant by [*an Universal Council*] viz. Universal as to that one Empire. But I know no *Universal Law-givers* to the whole Church on Earth, but Jesus Christ; neither Pope nor Council. If I am mistaken in this, I should be glad to be convinced: for it is of great moment: And is the hinge of our Controversie with *Rome*.

IV. He doth (to me) after all give up the whole Cause, and absolve me and all that I plead for from the guilt of Schism, and lay it on your Lordship, and such as you, if I can understand him when he saith, *Pag. 363*. ["It is clear that in the Church of *England*, there is no sinful Condition of Communion required, nor nothing imposed but what is according to the Order and Practice of the Catholick Church, there can be no pretence for any Toleration, &c."] And *Pag. 360*. ["There is no Question to be made but where there is an interruption in the Churches Communion, there is caused a Schism: and it must be charged on them that make the breach which will lye at their Doors, who by making their Communion unlawful, do unjustly drive away good Christians from it; neither doth such a Person that is driven away at present from the external Communion, cease to be a Member of that Church, but is a much truer Member thereof than that Pastor that doth unjustly drive him from his Communion. This fully satisfieth me; and if you will read my late small Book, called, *The Nonconformists Plea for Peace*,

Peace, you will see what it is that I think unlawful in the Impositions; And if you will read a new small Book of your old troubled Neighbour Mr. Jo. Corbet, called, *The Kingdom of God among Men*, I have so great an Opinion, that by it you will better understand us, and become more moderate and charitable towards us, that I will take your reading it for a very obliging Kindness to

Your Servant

December 11. 1679.

Ri. Baxter.

Add.V. His terms of Communion are not right, as I have proved.

VI. He speaketh against Toleration so generally without distinction, as if no one that dissented but in a word were tolerable, which is intolerable Doctrine in a pretended Peace-maker.

VII. He inferreth Toleration while he denieth it, in that he is against putting us to Death: How then will he hinder Toleration? Mulcts will not do it, as you see by the Law that imposeth 40 l. a Sermon: For when Men devoted to the Sacred Ministry have no Money, they will Preach and Beg: Imprisonment must be perpetual or uneffectual: for when they come out they will Preach again. And it contradicteth himself; for it will kill many Students being mostly weak) as it kill'd (by bringing mortal Sickness on them) those Learned, Holy Peaceable and Excellent Men, Mr. Jos. Allen of Taunton, Mr. Hughes of Plimouth, and some have died in Prison: And he that killeth them by Imprisonment, killeth them, as well

as he that burneth them or hangeth them. And the Prisons will be so full, as will render the Causers of it odious to many, and make such as *St. Martin* was separate from the Bishops; the same I say of Banishment.

Dr. Saywell's Principles infer as followeth;

I. Schismatics are not to be Tolerated. They that are for the sort of Diocesane Prelacy, which we disown are Schismatics: *Ergo*——not to be Tolerated.

The Major is *Dr. S's*. The Minor is proved thus.

They that are against that Episcopacy which the Primitive Universal Church was for and used, are Schismatics: The foresaid Diocesane Party are against that Episcopacy which the Primitive Universal Church was for and used—*Ergo* they are Schismatics.

The Major is *Dr. S's*. The Minor is thus proved, I. They that are for the deposing of the Bishops that were over every single Church that had one *Altar*, and those that were over every City Church, and instead of them setting up only one Bishop over a Diocess which hath a Thousand, or many Hundred Altars, and many Cities, are against the Episcopacy which the Primitive Universal Church was for: But such are the Diocesane Party now mentioned—*Ergo*—The Major is proved, not only from *Ignatius* who maketh one Altar and one Bishop with his Presbyters and Deacons, the note of Individuation to every Church, but a multitude of other proofs which I undertake to give: And from the Councils that determined that every City of Christians have a Church (till afterward they began to except small Cities)

The

The Minor is notorious Matter of Fact, every Parish with us hath an Altar, and many hundred have but one Bishop : *Ergo* they are no Churches according to the Saying, *Ubi Episcopus, ibi Ecclesia, & Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo adunata.* And Πόλις then signified every great Town, like our Corporations and Market-Towns : And *Titus* was to set Elders in every such City.

II. They that render Bishops Odious, endeavour to Extirpate Episcopacy. But so do (I need not name them)—*Ergo*—The Major is granted. The Minor is proved. 1. They that use Episcopacy to the Silencing of faithful Ministers of Christ, (near Two thousand at once, than whom no Nation under Heaven out of *Britain* hath so many better) and to render them and all that adhere to them odious and ruined, do that which will render Bishops odious—But—*Ergo*—

2. From Experience, when we treated with you 1661. the People would have gladly received Episcopacy as we offered it to you, and as the King granted it in his Declaration : But when they saw near Two thousand Silenced, and that Bishops thought all such as I, and the many better Ministers of the Countrey where I lived, to be *intolerable*, it hath done an hundred times more to alienate the People, from Episcopacy, than all the Books and Sermons of the Opposers of Episcopacy ever did : *e. g.* The People that I was over would reverently have received Pious Bishops : But though I never saw them, nor wrote to them one Letter against Episcopacy these 19 years, but have largely written, to draw them to Communion in the Parish Church, and much prevailed, yet they will now rather forsake me as a complier

with Persecuters (as *Martin* did the Bishops) than they would own our Diocesane Prelacy, since they saw me, and so many better Men of their Countrey Silenced, and cast out, and many of themselves laid in Jails with Rogues, and ruined for repeating a Sermon together, as they were always wont to do. He that will teach Men to love Prelacy by Prisons, Undoing them, and Silencing and ruining the Teachers whom they have found to be most edifying and faithful to them, will do more to extirpate Prelacy by making it odious, than all its Enemies could do; The reason of the thing seconded by full experience are undeniable proofs: No Men that I know of have done more against Episcopacy than Bishops: and (Pardon my free inviting you to Repentance) none that I know alive, either Sectaries or Bishops, more than you two, who I unfeignedly wish may have the honour before you die, of righting the Church and repairing the honour of true Episcopacy. It is a dreadful thing to us Nonconformists to think of appearing before God, under the Guilt of Silencing Two Thousand of our selves, if it prove our doing; If not, let them think of it that believe they shall be judged, *Prov. 26. 27. Whoso diggeth a Pit shall fall therein, and he that rolleth a Stone it shall return upon him.*

Chap. XVI. *The Second Letter to Bishop Gunning, after our first Conference.*

My Lord,

I Much desire some further help for my Satisfaction in the Three things, which we last Discourfed of. 1. Whether I mis-recited or mis-applied the Case of St. *Martin's* Separation? 2. Whether by *Ἐν ἑνωμένῳ*, in *Ignatius* be not meant One material Altar or Place of ordinary Communion of one Church? 3. What are the true terms of Universal Christian Concord? But the last is to me of so much greater Importance than the rest, that I will now forbear them, lest by diversion from this, my expectation should be frustrate. And seeing I profess in this to write to you with an unfeigned desire to learn, and also to take the Matter to be such as my very Religion and Church relation lyeth on; I beseech you either by your self, or some other whom you direct to speak your sense, to endeavour my better information.

The only terms or way of Universal Christian Concord you say is, Obedience to the Universal Church: and the Pastors are the Church: And he is not a true Member of the Church that doth not obey it: And this Church to be obeyed is not only a General Council, but also a Collegium Pastorum who rule per literas formatas, being Successors to the Apostles, who had this Power from Christ.

This is the Substance of what I understood from you. Here I shall first tell you what I hitherto

hitherto held, and next tell you wherein I desire Satisfaction.

I. I have hitherto thought, 1. That only Christ was a Constitutive Head of the Church Universal, and had appointed no Vicarious Head or Sovereign, either Personal or Collective, Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical. 2. Therefore none but Christ had now an Universal Legislative Power? nor yet an Universal Judicial and Executive. 3. And that this is the first and fundamental difference between us and the Church of Rome. 4. But I doubt not but that all the Pastors in the World may be intellectually thought on in an Universal Notion, and we may say with *Cyprian*, *Episcopatus est unus*, &c. as all the Judges and Justices and other Officers are Universally All the Governing Power of the Kingdom under the King; and as all the Individuals are the whole People as Subjects. 5. And I doubt not but each Pastor is in his place to be obeyed in all things which he is authorized to Command. 6. And these Pastors must endeavour to maintain Concord as extensive as is possible; to which end Councils and Communicatory Letters are to be used: And that the individual Pastors and People are obliged by the General Law of endeavouring to maintain Love and Concord, to observe the Agreements of of such Concordant Councils in all things Lawful belonging to their Determination. 7. And I doubt not but while there were but twelve Apostles, those twelve had under Christ, the Guidance of the whole Christian Church on Earth (which for a while might all hear them in one place;) and were to do their work in Concord: and had the Unity of the Spirit thereto, by which they infallibly

fallibly agreed in that which was proper to them, (and they had no Successors in) even, though they were never so distant, as well as when they were together, *Act. 15.* though in other things *Peter and Paul*, and *Paul and Barnabas* disagreed. And as in the recording of Christ's Works and Doctrine, in infallible Scriptures, so also they agreed in their Preaching it, and in the Practice of all that was necessary either to Salvation, or to the forming or Communion of the Churches. 8. But I supposed that none but those who were called to it immediately by Christ, or endued with the gift of Infallibility therein, were to be as his Mouth and Hand, in so delivering the Gospel, and writing the Holy Scriptures, as should be his Word, or Law to all the Christian World, and to all future Generations. 9. But as Prophets of old were the bringers of all new Revelations, and the Priests were but the Preservers, Expounders and Appliers of the Word which the Prophets had brought; So the Spirit in the Apostles, Evangelists and Prophets infallibly delivered that Word and Law, which all succeeding Pastors must Preach, Practise, and Rule by; as the only Universal Law.

This being hitherto my Judgment, if you are not mistaken, I am no Member of the Universal Church, and so no Christian, and therefore am incapable of Communion, and have not Christ's Spirit, nor title to Salvation, and therefore it concerneth me speedily to try, and receive Instructions: However we are of two Religions and Churches if you are in the right.

II. That which I have hitherto denied herein, is, I. That there is any Vicarious, Constitutive or Governing

Governing Head of the Church Universal, or Sovereign Power, Personal or Collective, having Supream, Universal, Legislative, Judicial and Executive Power under Christ, which all Christians are bound to be Subjects of, and to obey.

2. That Obedience to such an Universal Church-Sovereign or Power is not the necessary means or terms of Universal Concord or Communion :

1. Because there is no such Power.

2. If there be, it cannot be Universally known by Christians, 1. That it is, 2. What it is, 3. And in whom it is.

3. Nor can the Measure of Obedience to such Power necessary to Concord and Communion of all, be Universally known. 4. And *de facto*, there is no such Concord or Communion Universal in the World, nor ever was, at least since the Apostles days. Of these in order.

I. If there be any Vicarious Universal Supream Power that all must obey that will be Members of the Church, the Institution of it is to be found in Scripture, or in some other Divine Record : But no such thing is found in either, we have no other Divine Record that notifyeth this : and Scripture doth not. It is the Apostles Power that is the thing hence alledged. But, 1. While they were near the whole Church in its Infancy or small Number, Men could have sent to them for their Judgment : But so they could not, had they lived to see the Church in its present extent : If the twelve Apostles were now at *Jerusalem*, and we doubted of the Nestorian, Eutychian, Monothelite Controversies, and the rest in *Epiphanius* and *Philastrius* Catalogue. Could all the Christians in *America*, *Africa*, *Asia* and *Europe* know that the
major

major Vote of the Apostles met at *Jerusalem* had thus or thus decided? How few would live long enough for that Satisfaction. 2. The Apostles singly by an infallible Uniting Spirit were the Mouth of Christ to deliver obligatorily his Laws and Doctrine, without meeting to Consult and Vote it. *Paul* professeth *Gal. 1.* that he received not his Gospel from the Apostles, but from Christ: And his Epistles need not a proof of their Authority from the Votes or Consent of the rest; but were otherwise received: And so of other parts of Scripture. 3. The Apostles were to be dispersed about the World, and not to stay long together to Govern the World as a College: And while they stayed at *Jerusalem*, we read not of their doing any thing in a College and Conciliar way, save that *Act. 15. & 11.* which was, 1. No General Council from all the Churches: 2. Nor done by Apostles only; but the Elders and Brethren also of the Church at *Jerusalem*. 3. And was not laid on the Authority of a major Vote, but on the Apostolical Spirit of Infallibility and their special knowledge of Christ's mind, in which they all concurred.

2. Therefore their Authority of Teaching the World all Christ's Commands *M. 28-20.* being proper to them by these two advantages (being chosen Ear-witnesses, and having the Spirit to guide them into all truth) in this they have no Successors though they have in the continued parts of their Work. They were Christ's Instruments in Universal Legislation, and the Scripture written by them is his Word and Law, and they were accordingly enabled to Seal it by Miracles, and giving the Holy Ghost by Imposition of their Hands:

Hands: This Law of Christ all Christians own: But if in this they have Successors, 1. The Church hath a larger Law than we have thought on, and Gods Word is a greater Volume. 2. And Miracles are as necessary to Seal the new Word as to Seal the old.

II. The Scripture denieth a Vicarious *summam potestatem*, or Sovereignty over the Universal Church having a Legislative Power. 1. In that it saith that There is One Law-giver, *Jam. 4. 12.* that is, But One. 2. In calling Christ only the Head, Lord and King, and calling Apostles but Members, *1 Cor. 12. 27.* and Stewards and Ministers by whom we believe. 3. Baptizing us only into the Name of Christ, and not of the Apostles; and Baptism is Christening, and sheweth all that is necessary to make us Members of the Church and Body which Christ is the Saviour of. 4. *Paul* decryeth it as *Carnality* and Schism to think of Men above what is written, as if they had been Baptized into the Names of Men. 5. The Apostles did not Convert Men by preaching up themselves as Sovereign, but Christ, only professing themselves Witnesses and Messengers of his Words and Deeds: The Eunuch *Acts 8.* was Baptized by *Philip* upon his bare believing in Christ, without hearing the Vote of a Colledge of Apostles. Nor did the Preachers that Converted Men do it by the Argument of the Authority of such a Colledge. As *Dr. Hammond* saith on *1 Tim.* 3. [“ And such are all particular Churches of the whole World considered together, under the Supreme Head Christ Jesus, dispensing them all by himself, and administering them severally not by any one *Oeconomus*, but by the several Bishops”]

"shops as Inferior Heads of Unity to the several
 "Bodies, so constituted by the several Apostles
 "in their Plantations, each of them having an
 "*de Jure* a several distinct Commission from
 "Christ Immediately and Subordinate to *none* but
 "the Supream Donor or Plenipotentiary.]

(Neither to a Personal nor Collective Sovereign Power.)

The Judges of *England* have a Power which limitedly in their several Courts and Circuits respecteth all the Kingdom. But, 1. They have no Legislative Power. 2. Nor are they Constitutive Essential parts of the Kingdom: It would be the same Kingdom were their Power changed. 3. Therefore the Constitutive Oaths or Bond is only between King and Subjects, and we are not to Swear Allegiance to any other than the King. 4. Nor are they Judges out of their several Courts and Circuits. 5. Much less in other Kingdoms. 6. Nor is any a Judge to all the World, so is it in the Case in question, yet were they Apostles to the Universal Church, that which none are since their time:

III. If there be such a Vicarious Governing Sovereignty over the Universal Church, it is either the Pope, or a General Council, or some Colledge of Pastors: But it is none of these.

1. As to the Pope you say that he is so far from being Head of the Church that he is not a Member: So that I need not say more of this to you.

2. That General Councils are no such Sovereign Power which all must obey that will be Christians or in a Church, seemeth to me past doubt for these Reasons,

1. Be-

1. Because there is no such thing in the Creed, though the Catholick Church and Communion of Saints be there. But it would be there were it of such necessity to Christianity.

2. Because there is no such thing said in all the Scripture, which would not omit so necessary a point. What is said from *Acts* 15. is answered before; it was no General Council: A General Council was not then the necessary means of Concord or Communion.

3. There never was one General Council representing the Universal Church in the World. I have fully proved in my second Book against *Johnson*, that the Councils called General were so only as to the Roman Empire, (and few if any so General,) and that the Emperor called all the Chief Councils who had no Power without his Empire, nor called any that were without.

4. I have oft proved the unlawfulness of calling General Councils now, as the Church is dispersed at such distances over the Earth, and under Princes of so contrary Interests and Minds.

5. I have oft proved the Impossibility of such a Councils meeting to attain the ends of Government in question; being to pass by Sea and Land from all quarters of the World, by the Consent of Enemies that rule them, and through Enemies Countreys, and Men of Age, that must have so long time going, and sitting and returning, and of divers Languages incapable of understanding one another, and a number incapable of present converse, with other such insuperable difficulties.

6. If such Councils be necessary to the Being of Christianity, Church or Concord, at least the Church hath seldom had a Being, or Concord; it seldom

seldom having had such a Council in your own esteem : And you cannot say that it ever will have any.

7. If General Councils have Supream Government (visible) it is, 1. Legislative. 2. Judicial. 3. Executive.

But 1. If Legislative, then 1. Their Laws are either Gods Infallible Word, or not : If nor, all Men must disobey them when they err : If yea, Gods Word is not the same one Age as another, and is Crescent still ; and we know not when it will be perfect.

2. Their Laws will be so many that no Christians can know them, obey them, and have Concord on such terms.

3. If they could agree who should call them, and whither ; yet the Prince whose Countrey they meet in would be Master of the whole Christian World, and so of other Christian Countreys by Mastering them.

4. Princes would be Subjects, 1. To Foreign Powers. 2. Yea to the Subjects of other Princes. 3. Yea of their Enemies. 4. And to such Prelates as they are uncapable to know whether they are truely called to their Office. 5. Or whether they are erroneous or sound in Faith.

5. And then the Ecclesiastical Laws of all National Churches and Kings might be destroyed by such Councils as Superior Powers.

6. And no Princes or Synods could make valid Laws about Religion, till they knew that no Law of any such Council were against them.

7. The Laws of Christ recorded in Scripture would by all this be argued of great insufficiency : If more were Universally necessary, he that made

the rest would have made them, whose Authority is to the Church unquestionable.

8. The Christian World is divided so much in Opinion, that except in what Christs own word containeth plainly, they are in no probability of agreeing. So much of Legislation.

II. As to Judgment. 1. To judge the sence of a Law (Scripture or Canon) for the common Obligation of the Church, is part of the Legislative Power, and belongs to the Law-makers. 2. To judge the Case of Persons, *e. g.* whether *John, Peter, Nestorius, Luther, Calvin, &c.* be a Heretick, an Adulterer, a Simonist, &c. requireth that the Accuser and Accused, and Witnesses of both be present and heard speak: But he that would have all Hereticks, Criminals, Accusers, Witnesses, travel for a Tryal to *Jerusalem, Nice, Constantinople, Rome, even from America, Ethiopia, &c.* will not need any Confutation.

III. *The same I say of Executive Silencing, Ejecuting, Excommunicating, &c.*

II. A Sovereign Power that cannot be known, is not necessary to Christianity, or the Constitution, Communion or Concord of the Church. But General Councils so impowered cannot be known.

I. I have shewed that it cannot be known by ordinary Christians that there are any such Authorized by Christ. I know it not, nor any that ever I was familiar with: The main Body of the Reformed Churches know it not; for they ordinarily deny it as the prime point of Popery. They cannot prove it, who affirm it: Therefore they know it not, as others may judge. Millions are Baptized Christians that never knew it.

II. It

II. It is not to this day known which were true General Councils that are past : Some say those were *Latrocinia* and Conventicles that others say were Lawful Councils. Some are for but four; some for six; some for eight; some for all so called; there is no agreement which are true and obligatory. *Grotius* is for *Trent* and all; which others abhor.

2. It is not known who hath Power to call them, and whose call is valid.

3. Nor what Individuals or Particular Churches are capable of sending and chusing, and obliged to it. Almost all the Christian World is judged incapable by the most of Christians. The Papists are so judged by the Greeks, Protestants, &c. The Eastern and Ethiopian Christians, are excluded by the Papists, Greeks, &c. as Jacobites, Nestorians, Schismatics, &c. The Greeks are excluded by the Papists and others as Schismatics and Erroneous. The Protestants are judged Hereticks and Schismatics by the Papists and many Greeks, &c. How Lutherans and Calvinists, Diocesans and Presbyterians, &c. judge of one another, I need not tell. And can all or any of them know which of these must make up a Legislative Council of the whole Church on Earth?

4. It is not known how many must Constitute such a Council, nor in what proportions. If there be innumerable Bishops under *Philippicus* for the Monothélites out of the East (as *Binnius* saith) and few out of the West, was that a true General Council? If at *Nice*, *Ephesus*, *Constantinople*, *Chalcedon*, there be not one out of the West to twenty or forty, or a hundred others, is it a true representative of the whole Church? If there be

two hundred at *Trent*, or a thousand at *Basil* out of the West, or some few parts of it, and few from the East, and none from *Ethiopia*, *Armenia*, *America*, and many other Churches; are these a true Universal Council? And can we all be here resolved?

The Countrey where the Council meeteth, and the Prince who is for them, will have more Bishops there, than any, if not all the rest; when remote parts, and the Churches under Enemies, or dissenting Princes will have few.

5. The same Councils that had most for them under one Prince, have had most Bishops against them under the next, and so off and on for many Successions: We know that the Council of *Nice* was mostly for the truth, because we try it by the Word of God: Else how should it be known after; when under *Constantius* and *Valens* most of the Bishops by far, in Councils and out, were Arrians? The World groaned to find it self grown Arrian. The Council of *Constantinople*, in the beginning set up *Greg. Nazianzen*, and in the end was against him? Which part was the Universal Governor? The first Council at *Ephesus* was against *Nestorius* till *Joh. Antiochenus* came; and then it divided into two, which condemned each other; and after by the Emperors threatening was united: The *Chalcedon* Council carried most while *Martian* Reigned; and after most condemned and cursed it; and then again most were for it, and under other Emperors most cursed it again; and under *Zeno* the most were for Neutrality or Silencing the difference. The Eutychians had far most at *Ephes. 2.* and a while after under *Theodos. 2.* and *Anastasius*, &c. And under others (and

(and most Princes) most were against them, and called *Eph. 2. Latrocinium.* And yet most of the East have been for *Dioscorus* ever since, saving the Greeks. The Monothelites had far most (innumerable Bishops out of the East, saith *Binnius ut supra*) under *Philippicus* in a Council, yea, saith *Binnius*, the Council at *Trullu* in *Constant.* were Monothelites, and yet the same Men that were at the foregoing approved fifth General Council at *Const.* And over and over most Bishops were for one side, and most for the other, as Princes changed afterward. Under *Justinian* most seemed for the *Phantasiasta* against the *Corrupticola* : Which yet are since (with *Justinian*) accounted persecuting Hereticks. The approved Council at *Const. de tribus Capitulis* had some time most Bishops for it, and sometime most against it : Inso-much that it occasioned much of *Italy* it self to renounce the Popes headship and set up the Patriarch of *Aquileia* as their Chief. The Council at *Nice 2.* and others for Images, and so others against them, have been so oft and notoriously under one Emperor owned by most, and under another condemned by most, yea by the same Bishops owned and after disowned, that no Man can tell which of them to take for the Universal Legislators or Rulers of the Church by the number of the Bishops, but only we must know which of them were found by the Word of God. And since them, what Council ever was there that could be so known by numbers to be of Authority ? *Constance* and *Basil* that had the greatest numbers are condemned by *Florence*, and by the most of the Roman Church. No Man can tell us of all that are past, what Councils are of obliging Authority.

thority and must be obeyed by any outward Note, but only by trying them by the VVord of God.

6. And what wonder, when there is no other certain Note by which an obliging Council can be known from others? (And he that knoweth what God saith without the Council needs it not.) The Papists have no Note of difference but the Popes Approbation. And Protestants know that this is no proof of their Authority. At *Eph. 2. Bellarmine* and *Binnins* tell us that the consent was so general, that only *St. Peter's Ship* escaped drowning. At *Const. 1.* they confess that the Pope had not so much as a Legate: By what Note shall we know the true and Authorized Councils from the rejected, when part of the Christian VVorld is for one and against another, and the other part contrary?

III. And there is no Agreement in what the Power of such Councils materially doth consist, and what it is that they may command us, and what not.

IV. Nor is there any Agreement which and how many are their true Obligatory Laws, when we have such huge Volumes of Decrees and Canons; woe to us if all these must necessarily be obeyed to our Concord or Salvation. And if not all, how shall we know which?

V. Nor do we know how we must be sure that all these Canons indeed were Currant and had the Major Vote; or many be Counterfeit; when the Africans had then such a stir with the Pope about the *Nicene* or *Sardican* Canon; and when to this day the Canons of the *Laterane Council* *sub Innoc. 3.* are justified by most and denied by many.

VI. If

VI. If this could be known to a few Learned Men, it is certain that to most Christians, yea Ministers it cannot: To me it is not. And it's certain that all Christians, nor all Ministers are not obliged to so great a task as to search all the Councils, till they know which they be, and which the Laws which they must obey.

III. And as the Power and Laws cannot be known, so it is certain that Obedience to these is not the necessary means of Christianity, Concord or Communion, because the necessary measure of such Obedience cannot be known to such a use; Christ in his Institution of Baptism and other ways, hath told what he hath made necessary to be a Member of the Universal Church, and how all such must live in Love and Peace, in obeying the rest of his Word so far as they can know it. But you that make Obedience to a visible Power over the Church Universal, necessary to our Membership, can never tell us which is the necessary Degree! If it be all the Canons and Mandates that must be so obeyed, no Man can be saved: much less can the Churches all have Concord on such terms! yea, every Christian: If it be not all, who can tell us which be the necessary Canons, and Acts of Obedience, and distinguish Essentials from Integrals, unless you will return to the Word of God, and say that The Covenant of Grace is Essential, which we may know without these Councils Laws. The *Ministry of Councils* teaching us how to know God's Word and Laws is one thing, and their own pretended universally obliging Legislation is another.

Of all this I have said much in the second Part of my Key for Catholicks, and in my foresaid Rejoinder to *W. Johnson*.

II. But

II. But you tell me of another Church Power which all must obey that will have Communion and Concord, which you call *Collegium Pastorum*.

If none be Church Members or Christians that understand not what this is (much less do obey it) I doubt the Church is still a little Flock indeed: For I understand it not, nor know one Man that I think doth.

1. Is this College of Pastors to Rule while General Councils sit, or but in the intervals? If *sedente Concilio*, which of them is Supream? If only *between Councils*; have they a *Legislative Power*, or only the *Judicial and Executive*? If the former, where are their Laws to be found? that all the Church may know them? And I ask all the Questions before askt of the Laws of Councils: How shall we know which be Current? and necessary? and which are not?

If not, then they are no Supream Rulers that have no *Legislative Power*?

2. Who be these Men that make this College? we cannot obey them till we know them; Are they all the Bishops in the World, or but part? If but part, which part, and who, and where shall we find them? I know you will not say they are the upstart College of Cardinals, nor the Roman Clergy only: And I never heard of any others besides Councils that pretended to it: *viz.* To be Universal Governours.

If it be All the Bishops of the World; 1. Do they meet to Consent, or do they not? If they do and must, when, where, how? was there ever such a meeting which was no Council? No, you say, It is *per literas formatas*.

2. Are these *Literas formatae*, *Legislative*, *Judicial* or *Executive*? If none of these, they are no Acts of Government. And I asked, where shall we find them if they are our Laws? If they be Judicial and Executive, whither is it that the Accusers, Accused and Witnesses must come to be heard speak before the Sentence was passed *per literas formatas*: e. g. *Theodoret*, and the rest *de tribus Capitulis*, when it must be judged, 1. Whether they wrote such words? 2. What the sence was? 3. Whether they were Heretical? 4. Whether they repented; and must we go to all the Bishops in the World one by one for tryal? or be judged without being ever heard?

3. I cannot imagine what can be here said, unless it be that some Bishops first do the thing, and then others do *per Literas* consent. But, 1. Do some Bishops first make Laws for all the World, and then the rest consent, or only for their own Churches? By what Authority do they the first?

2. Or do some Bishops try and judge a Man, e. g. in this or that Country and Parish, and then all the rest in the World consent, that never hear them, or hear of them? Every Man (nor any) is not Excommunicated *per Literas formatas*, by all the Bishops in the World, or most. 3. But it is not the Executive or Judicial Acts that our Question is concerned in, but the Rule of Obedience, which is a Law. As it was never known that Men must not be taken in by Baptism, or cast out by Excommunication, till all the Bishops on Earth agree to it; so no Universal Laws are extant that were made by such Letters.

4. And how can this be the Rule, and Test of Christianity, or Church-membership or Concord,
when

when no Christians, much less all, can possibly know that all or most Bishops have *per Literas*, consented to such obliging Laws? 1. How can we prove that ever any went over all the World to them? (*Drake* or *Candish* did it not.) 2. And that they opened the Case aright to them? 3. And that these Laws had the Major Vote? 4. And that they are not forged or corrupted since? 5. And that these were true Bishops themselves that did it in *America*, *Ethiopia*, *Armenia*, *Greece*, &c. out of our reach?

6. Yea, What possibility is there of any such known Agreement, when it's known that almost all the Christian World is divided into Parties, which disagree and censure one another? The English Diocesans and Church differeth from the Roman, and the most, or many of the Reformed. The Lutherans from the Calvinists; The Papists from us all, and from the Greek, and the Greek from them and us; and all from the Abassines, Copties, Syrians, called Jacobites, Nestorians, &c. and from the Armenians, Georgians, Circassians, Mengrelians, Russians, &c. How shall I, and all the Ministers on Earth, yea, and all Christians, know that all these have *per Literas formatas*, made Laws which all must necessarily obey?

But if it be only the *Sound Part* that hath this Universal Government, how can I, and all Men know which, and who that is? Hearsay of Adversaries report will not tell us; and almost all on Earth are condemned or accused by the rest, or most, or many. And we must hear them (that dwell at the *Antipodes* or *Jerusalem*, &c.) before we judge them, so far as to exclude them from the Sacred Power.

If it be said, That it is not the *making of New Laws*, that is done by this *Collegium Pastorum* all over the world, but their *Consent* to those that Councils made: I answer, 1. Are they not Valid upon the Councils making them? Then Councils have not Legislative Power. 2. If it be left impossible to most to know which were true Councils, and which are their Valid Laws, when the present Assemblies have best opportunity to signifie Consent, how impossible will it be to know which Councils and which Laws (and in what sense) are approved by all the Bishops in the World, or by most? And that the Votes were faithfully gathered? And by whom? And that the Major part are the Rulers of the Minors.

Will. Johnson saith, That it is a General Judicial Sentence, *De Speciebus*, and not *De Individuis*, that Councils use; *E. g.* [*We Anathematize all that hold or do this or that.*] But, 1. It's known that they Anathematized many Individuals. 2. No Man can be bound by it, till it fall upon Individuals. Condemning *Arrians*, proveth no Man to be an *Arrian*: Forbidding us to hear Hereticks, obligeth none not to hear him that is not proved a Heretick: Judgment must be of Individuals before it can be executed.

He that must obey the Universal Church, must be commanded by the Universal Church, and must know *that* they command him, and *what* they command him; which is to me, and to most impossible.

4. *William Johnsons* and his Parties last Answer is, That the People must Believe their own individual Pastors, telling them what the Universal Church commandeth: And indeed there is no other

ther way practicable ; But then, 1. This is but a trick to make every Pastor the Lord of our Faith and Souls ; on pretence of obeying the Universal Church. And if this be your sense it will amount to this [*No man is a Christian that believeth not his Pastor telling him what the Universal Church commandeth.*]

2. But I find most Teachers are as ignorant as I am, who know not such Universal Authority or Laws.

3. Archbishop *Usher*, and many other Bishops, thought that General Councils were not for Regiment, but Concord : And he that believeth no such Governing Power, cannot declare it to his Flock, nor obey it.

4. By this way, most Christians shall be bound on pain of Damnation to believe Untruths, and things contrary to what others must believe, *e.g.* In *Abassia*, *Egypt*, *Syria*, &c. they will be bound to believe one thing. and at *Constantinople* another, &c. Those called now Nestorians, are by Travellers said to own none of that Heresie, but to Condemn the Council of *Chalcedon* and *Eph. 1.* for wronging *Nestorius*, as *Innocent* did them that condemned *Chrysostome* : Those called Jacobites and Eutychians are said to have no more of the Heresie, but to condemn the said *Chalcedon* Council for wronging *Dioscorus*, and to own the second *Ephesine* Council : some will be bound to be for Images in Churches, and some against them ; some for *Constantinople*, and some for *Rome's* Supremacy, (and all in their Countries to be Papists) for their Pastors tell them that the Catholick Church is on their side : yea, in the same Country (as in *England*) some must be for Arminianism (as it is called)

called) and some against it ; some for the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and some against it; some for free Prayer in the Pulpit, and some against it, &c. For on both sides their differing Pastors plead the Authority of the Church : Few Christians can thus agree in any thing but Christ's plain Laws, which I shewed are the terms of Concord.

If we must appeal from particular Pastors, to whom is it? If to Councils, to whom must we appeal from disagreeing Councils? If to the whole Church on Earth, how shall we hear from them and know their mind? I never saw, nor knew any Man that saw any *litteras formatas* subscribed by all Bishops scattered through the Earth.

5. You that are Zealous against Popery, I presume would not have me be a Papist : But I cannot avoid it if I receive your Doctrine (that there is a Church-Power in a Council or College of Pastors, to Govern the Universal Church : and that none are in the Church, nor have the Spirit that obey not this Universal Church of Pastors, and that to obey them is the only means, or terms of Concord.)

For, 1. I then yield them the fundamental difference, That there is one Universal *summa Potestas*, or Visible Head (Collective) under Christ.

2. And if so, I cannot deny it to be the Pope as the *Principium Unitatis*, and the Chief Executor of the Laws, and the first Bishop in Councils. For Councils are rare, and the Church is a Church when there are no Councils: And the Pope is a known Person, and *Rome* a known Place, and accessible, and no other pretendeth to this Power that I know of: And the Executive Power must be

be Constant : And any other Supream accessible College is unknown to me and all that I can speak with, and I can no more obey them, than a College of Angels unknown to me. If the Church have a visible Vicarious Supream, the Pope is likest to be he, as to the constant Executive Power, and the President of Councils. I suppose you take the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, and the French for Papists ; though they set a Council above the Pope.

6. The World hath no Universal Civil Government under God ; neither a Monarch, nor a College or Council of Kings. All the World is Governed by Men *per partes* in their several Dominions, as all *England* is under the King, by all the Mayors, Bailiffs and Justices : But there is no Council of Justices that are *One Universal Governour Collective* : Nor is the Dyet of Princes, or any Council of Kings one Supream Government of the Earth. A Logical universality there is, as all Rulers considered notionally rule all the World by Parts, but no Political Head or Universal Governour over the whole, whom all the Parts must obey.

I. If now I am in the right, and you mistaken, then you wrongfully deny the Spirit, Church-Membership, and consequently Salvation as well as Concord, to all Protestants that ever I knew or read, who deny a visible Universal Church Head, Personal or Collective ; And I think to most in the World. And what Schism that is, I need not say.

II. If I am in the wrong, I am no Christian, nor Church Member, nor can be saved (For you say, [This Body so governed only hath the Spirit]:
And

And I cannot help it ; not knowing possibly how to know , 1. Who this College is ? 2. What Councils. 3. Or which be the Laws which I must obey , 4. Nor with what degree of Obedience. 5. Nor that they have such Power. How great need have I then earnestly to beg your speedy help for my Information : Which will oblige

Your Servant

Decemb. 27. 1679.

Ri. Baxter.

Chap. XVII. *The Third Letter to Bishop Guning.*

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ely.

My Lord,

THough in Conference I told you the Sense which I had of your words , yet judging it my duty to think of them over and over again, I also judge it my duty in Writing to leave with you the sum of such a Judgment as I am able to pass on them , on my best Consideration , leaving it now to your self whether you will by word or writing return any further Answer , my hopes of Satisfaction thereby being very low.

The sum of your Speech which I am concerned in, is as followeth :

1. *“ That certainly a Supream Vicarious Governing Power there is in the Bishops by Christ’s Institution, 1. Because it is Prophecied, Isai. 60. 12. “ That the Nation and Kingdom that will not serve “ the*

"the Church shall perish; And the word Church is
 "never put for Christ. 2. And the Apostles only
 "were admitted by Christ to his last Supper, and so
 "the Power of Administring that Sacrament till
 "Christ come, is given only to them, and such as they
 "shall give that Power to. 3. And it was not Paul
 "and Barnabas that had the infallible judgment of
 "that Case decided, Act. 15. but the College of the
 "Apostles.

II. "That this Supream Vicarious Governing Power
 "over the whole Church on Earth is, 1. In all the
 "Christian Bishops of the World, 2. And the Major
 "part goeth for the whole, 3. And General Councils
 "are their Representatives, and so have this Power.
 "4. And that to such Councils it is enough that all
 "be called, though all be not there. 5. And it is
 "their reception by the Church Universal, which must
 "prove their Universal Power, and the Obligation of
 "their Laws. 6. And though the Universality of
 "Bishops be not always in such a Council, they have
 "always that Power which in Councils is to be used:
 "as the Judges out of Term time. 7. And that if
 "I, or any will publish a Heresie, we shall know where
 "that Church is by their Censure. 8. But as Pro-
 "mulgation is necessary to the Obligation of Laws, so
 "many that never can or do hear of the foresaid Uni-
 "versal Church-Governing Power or what their Laws
 "are, or what is the sence of them, may be saved
 "without them, by the reading of the Word; as many
 "that have not the Scriptures may be saved without
 "them.

"And this you say answers three parts of my last
 "Papers. 9 Of these General Councils it is only six that
 "you own as such, Nice 1. Const. 1. Eph. 1. Chalced.
 "Const. 2. (de tribus Capitulis) & Const. 3. against
 "the Monorhelites.

III. "You

III. "You say that These six things are the Govern^ging Acts of this Chief Power.

1. To judge which are the true Books of Scripture,
"and the true Copies and Readings.

2. "To judge what is the sence of the Fundamen-
"tals, Baptism, Creed, whose words misunderstood
"will not save any.

3. "To judge and declare what is the true Church
"Government instituted by Christ and his Apostles,
"or delivered by them.

4. "To judge and declare what are the instituted
"Ordinances e. g. Confirmation as it is a giving of the
"Holy Ghost by Imposition of Hands, and not only
"an owning of our Baptismal Covenant, which we do in
"every Sacrament : and so of other Ordinances.

5. "A Judicial Power, not of all individual Cases,
"but that those e. g. that hold or do this or that be
"Excommunicate.

6. "A Legislative Power, to make alterable Ca-
"nons or Orders of the Church Universal. This is
the sum of all your Explicatory Discourses : To
which I answer.

§. I. To your proofs that such a Universal Go-
verning Church there is instituted. 1. To *Isai. 60. 12.*
I say, 1. It is not safe stretching dark Prophetical
Texts, farther than we can prove they are intend-
ed. The New Testament plainlier tells us the
Church State and Power than the Old.

2. The Universal Church hath not expounded
the Text, whether it speak of the state of the
Jews after the Captivity, or of the State of the
Catholick Church now, or of the more Blessed
State of it at the last, when it is more perfected,
Therefore how are you sure that you have the
true sence of it without the Churches Exposition?

3. The words indeed are nothing for a Vicarious Sovereign Power. Every Political Body is essentiated by the *Pars imperans*, and the *Pars subdita*: Christ is the only essentiating *Pars imperans* in Supreme Power: Christ then is the Prime part of the Church: The word [Church] then is not put for [Christ] alone, but for the Society consisting of King and Subjects, and sometimes for the Subjects alone. It's oft said that many Nations served the Israelites: we say, many Countreys were subject to the Romans, the Medes, Persians, Greeks, Turks: and we do not mean that either the Turkish, Roman, Persian, &c. Common Subjects did govern all these Nations, nor that their Bailhaws, Judges, Magistrates, &c. as one *Persona Politica in summa potestate* ruled them by a Major Vote: If the King will say that all the Corporations in *Middlesex* shall be under *London*, or obey or serve it: Who would feign such a sense of it, as to say that there must be therefore some Power to rule them by a Vicarious Supremacy beside the ordinary Government, or that all the City must Govern by a Major Vote. The sense is plain. As we all 1. Obey the King as the Universal Constitutive Head, 2. And the Judges, Justices, Mayors, as ruling under him *per partes*, in their several Places. 3. And we serve all the Kingdom; as we serve its common good, which is the *finis regiminis*; So other Countreys served the Romans, Greeks, Turks, &c. And so all Kingdoms should serve the Church or Kingdom of Christ; that is, 1. *Christ* as the only Head and Universal Governour: 2. All his Officers as particular Governours in their several Limits and Places (but none as Rulers of the whole)

3. And

3. And the *bonum Commune*, or all the Church as the End of Government. And how can we feign another sence ?

§. 2. To your second Proof I answer, 1. The 70 Disciples were Christ's constant Attendants as his Family, with whom he was to Eat the Passover.

2. We all grant that none have Power to Celebrate the Eucharist, or Govern the Church but the Apostles, and those to whom the Spirit of Christ in them did Communicate it. But we say that they Communicated it to the Order of Presbyters, as I thought all had Confessed (as some Councils do.) 3. The Apostles were not appointed as one Supream ruling College to give the Sacrament by their Votes to all the World, but each one had Power to do it in his place : Nor did they *Ordain* only as a College by such Vote (as *Una persona Politica*) but each one had Power to do it alone : Nor did they write the *Scriptures* as one *Collective Person* by Vote, but each one had the Spirit and Power to do it, (as *Paul* did, &c.) nor did they sit on *one Throne*, or had the promise so to do, to Judge the Tribes of *Israel*, as one College by Vote, but to sit on twelve Thrones Judging the twelve Tribes, as under Christ the only Universal Head and Governour.

§. 3. To your third I answer, 1. I answered to that *Act. 15.* in my last to you. 2. *Paul* and *Barnabas* had the same Infalible Spirit, and had before said the same against the keeping of *Moses* Law : But 1. *Recipitur ad modum recipientis* : No wonder if among those that quarrelled with *Paul*, the Consent of those that had received Christ's Mind from his own Mouth and Spirit, did better

satisfie the doubtful, than one Man's word alone.
2. And Christ's Work was to be done in Unity.

§. 4. II. As to the Seat of this Power I answer,
1. All the true Bishops of the World Govern the particular Churches as Kings Govern all the Kingdoms of the World, under God, one Universal Monarch: But there is neither one, Universal Monarchical, Aristocratical or Democratical Sovereign, Civil or Ecclesiastical under Christ: But each hath his own part.

§. 5. 2. I have shewed the impossibility of our judging of the Major Votes at our distances in most controverted Cases.

§. 6. 3. And I have, where I told you, proved that there never were, must or will be true Universal Councils, much less are such the standing Governours of the Church. But in Cases of need, such as can well do it, should come to help each other by Council and Concord, without pretending to Universal Governing Power.

§. 7. 4. 1. Who called them to *Nice*, *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, *Constantinople*, &c. out of the Extra-Imperial Countries?

2. Who shall call them now out of the Empire of the Turk, *Abassia*, the Mogul, *Tartary*, and the rest?

3. If calling Men make the Council Universal though they come not, is it a Council if none come? or how many must it be to ascertain us that it is Universal? Hath the Pope the Calling Power? or who is it, and how proved, that they that obey it not may be unexcuseable?

§. 8. 5. I have told you how unable I am to know what the Major part of all Christians or Bishops in the World receive, save only by uncertain

certain fame, faving that while I know otherwise what is neceffary truth, I know that they are not the Church that receive it not, whoever they be. I am a Stranger to *Abaffia, Armenia, Georgia, India, Ruffia, Mexico, &c.* And what if I never knew that there are fuch Countries in the World?

2. I can eafily prove what I told you, how oft the Major Part hath changed, yea, the fame Bifhops upon the change of Princes, and cried, *Omnes Peccavimus.* And who knoweth by Majority of Votes, which Years they were in the right?

3. Either the Canons of Councils were obligatory upon the Promulgation before the abfent Bifhops in all Countries received them, or not; If yea, then it is not Universal Reception that made them fo: If not, then the abfent are not bound to receive them.

4. How many Years will it be after a Council before we can know whether all or moft of the Chriftian World receive it? By all that I can read in Hiftory, I cannot tell, *e. g.* whether more Bifhops were for the Council of *Chalcedon*, or againft it, for the time of feven or eight Emperors Reign; Nor whether more now be for or againft the fecond *Nicene* Council (which the Lutherans fo much favour) and fo of many more. And every one cannot know it, nor fetch his Faith, or Religion from a Catalogue of all the Chriftian Bifhops in the World, or a Calculation of their numbred Votes.

§ 9. 6. *Frufta eft Potentia quæ non reducitur, nec reducenda eft in actum.* 1. Indeed as the Pope is naturally uncapable of Governing all the Chriftian World, All Bifhops on Earth are much more uncapable as one Collective Voting Power, but only

per partes in their several Limits. 2. How can I obey a Power that acteth not?

§. 10. 7. Alas what abundance of Heresies have been Published since the Six Councils which you own? yea, by Ranters, Quakers, Familists, &c. in our times, besides *Beckman's* Catalogue of German Fanaticks. And yet what Univerſal Council, or *Litera formata* of all the World, have given us ſufficient notice of their Evil? How fooliſhly have the Papiſts done about Jansenianisms, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin *Mary*, &c. to ſeek the Pope's Determination, if the ſenſe of all the Biſhops of the World can be known to decide the Caſe? How many Heresies have been Condemned in Councils ſince the Sixth Council, of which the whole Church hath no otherwiſe notified their ſenſe (as in the Caſe of *Philoponus* of Images, of *Elipandus*, and *Felix*, of Abbot *Joachims Abeilard*, of *Gilbert Porretane*, of *Wecilo*; of *Berengarius*, *Wickliffe*, *Huſſe*) whether it was Heresie or not? You ſay, *If I broach a Heresie, the Univerſal Church will ſoon tell me where they are by Condemning it*: When Multitudes have been broached theſe laſt Thouſand Years, of which thoſe in *Abaffia*, *Syria*, *Egypt*, *Armenia*, and moſt of the Chriſtian World, have never told us that ever they were Judged, or ſo much as heard? Shall no Biſhops or Provincial Council condemn new Heresies, but leave *e.g. Svenkfeldius*, *David George*, *Servetus*, *Pomponatius*, *Vaninus*, and a hundred ſuch to paſs for good Chriſtians, till they hear from all the Biſhops of the World? And what need General Councils be gathered to Condemn ſuch, if we can know the ſenſe of all without them?

§. 11. 8. If one that cannot know the sence of all the Bishops on Earth, may ordinarily be a good Christian, and saved by the Scripture only, then why should they be sent to enquire of all the Bishops on Earth, when a sure and nearer way is at hand.

2. And then such may be of the Church and have Christ's Spirit, that obey not such a Vicarious Church Head.

3. And if want of *Promulgation* nullifie the Obligation, that is no Governing Vicarious Sovereign to all the Christian World, which cannot Promulgate his Laws to all. Neither I, nor any that ever I knew, can tell how to know the Minds of all the Bishops on Earth, or gather their Votes, so as to rule our Obedience; If the Scripture could not be commonly made known, it could be no common Rule; as it is not to them that have it only in unknown Tongues.

§. 12. 9. What shall satisfie any Man that the Six Councils owned by you are the Acts of a Supreme Vicarious Universal Church Power, and no other? but those, 1. If the *Pars imperans* in Supremacy be (as Politicks say) a Constitutive Essential part of the Society, then since the sixth Council, the Church hath been no Church for want of an Essential part, if Councils were that part: But if it be all the dispersed Bishops, the Head hath been *in nudâ Potentiâ*, unactive these Thousand Years, as the Socinians say the separated Soul is till the Resurrection, or as one in an Apoplexy.

2. This favoureth the Seekers, who say that the Church this Thousand Years hath been lost in the Wilderness, or asleep.

3. The same Councils have done and undone. That at *Const. 1.* in the beginning set up *Greg. Naz.* and in the end forced him to resign going about to depose him; which part was obligatory? That at *Ephes.* first, was first one, and after two, and *Nestorius*, *Cyril* and *Memnon*, were all Condemned, and after two of them restored, and *Joh. Antioch:* and *Cyril* by *Theodosius* threats were brought to confess that they had differed but in Words, and did not know it: Which part was Obligatory? That at *Chalcedon* consisted of many, yea most that had gone contrary in *Ephes. 2.* and cried, *Omnes peccavimus*, and so did many others, and most Bishops were oft and long against it after. That at *Const. de Tribus Capitulis*, is noted commonly as a meer Cheat and abuse put on *Justinian* by an Eutychian, and condemned three dead Mens Words before at *Chalcedon* absolved, set the World (even *Italy*) into a greater Schism. If you are sure all these are Universally Obligatory, prove it, and prove that no other are as much so. Divers others were as numerous, and called by as good Authority. If you say, as of *Ephes. 2.* they were *Latrocinia* and forced; I answer, No more than many others. At *Const. 1. Nazianzen* tells you they raged like Mad Men: At *Ephes. 1.* they fought it out even before the Emperors Commissioners. *Theodosius 2d.* used his over-ruling Power at both *Eph. 1. & 2.* What force was used in that under *Philippicus*, and many others that erred and were more numerous than such as you receive. *Sola navicula Petri*, saith *Binius*, escaped Drowning at *Eph. 2.* so Concordant were they all; What have you against even *Constance* and *Basil* on your Grounds? If you say they erred, I grant it: and how

how shall we know that none of the Six did so ? It was not their *Number* nor *Consent* that proved them in the right. Tell us how to know the Councils that we must obey from all the rest ? Is it by other Councils Testimony ? that is, to run in a Vain Circle : How know we that the later is right other way than of the former ? Is it by Scripture or by Reason. Tell us how, without subverting your own Foundation, the Sovereignty of Councils.

4. Do you hold all the Six Councils still obligatory as the Rule of our Obedience and Communion *E. g.* 1. That at *Nice* 1. and the *Quini Sextum* at *Trull* forbid *Adoring by genuflexion on any Lords Day, &c.* And no General Council hath revoked it, but above a Thousand Years after it wore out by degrees in most Churches : And yet Thousands of Christians are here to be denied Sacramental Communion, if they keep these Canons even in the reception of the Eucharist : and Hundreds, yea Thousands of Christ's Ministers shall be silenced, ejected, and ruined if they will not Assent and Consent so to use them. How many Canons in the Six Councils can I name which do not now bind us ?

§. 13. As to the work of Councils and Bishops named by you ; 1. As to our receiving the true Scripture from an Universal Church-Governing Authority. 1. *Paul's* Epistles were received otherwise. Yea, there is no mention of any part of the New Testament that was not received till such Universal Government required it.

2. If I must first know the said Church Authority before I receive the Scripture, how shall I know it ? Not by the Scriptures ; for that is supposed

posed yet not received: If by the Assertors Authority, that is to know they have it, because they have it, which is the Question. If by some fore-known Character of Infallibility, what is it? unless with *Knot* you come to the Miracles of the present Church, I know not what can be said.

3. But is not the common Protestant way (which you call *Chillingworth's*) much surer? 1. VVe first receive the Matter of Fact Historically, (that such Persons were, and wrote such Books, and did such Deeds) from the Concurrent Testimony of all Credible VVitnessees. some Enemies, some Hereticks, the generality of Lay-Christians, Presbyters that in all Churches received and used them, and Bishops also as credible entrusted Keepers of these Records: As we know the Laws of the Land, by Judges, Lawyers, People, and all that make up a full Historical Certainty, and not from some fore-known Universal-Governing Bishops Judicial Sentence. 2. And the Matter of Fact being known by certain Historical Evidence, I have so largely shewed how the rest is known in my *Reasons of Christian Religion, and Life of Faith, &c.* that I will not repeat it: Do you think that most (or any) Christians before they received the Scriptures, did first otherwise know that all the Bishops on Earth are by God authorized to be a Supreme Collective Sovereign to the Church, and to judge infallibly which are the true Scriptures for all the People, and that they are now most of them true Bishops? &c. Which way are all these things to be known?

We deny not that Ministers are by Office entrusted to keep, expound and preach the S. Scriptures: But we use against the Papists herein, to distinguish

distin
fador
Auth
furo,
Wor
is pr
of th
Subj
sense
migh
poun
Pow
appl
Cafe
If
reall
Nar
rupt
ral C
cann
judg
them
4. A
them
cord
And
rupt
have
Corr
pren
Hist
4.
Nat
men
cally

distinguish the Authority of a Teacher or Ambassador, from the Authority of a Judge; and the Authority of an Official limited Judge, *in proprio foro*, from that of an Universal Judge to all the World. Indeed it is commonly granted, that it is proper to the Law-makers to judge of the sense of their own Law, so as Universally to oblige the Subjects: For it is part of Legislation it self, the sense of the Law being the very Law: Else Judges might make us what Law they please, by expounding the Words as they please. But the Power of Judicatures is limitedly to expound and apply the Law only to the decision of particular Cases that come before them.

If the Question be, Whether our Statutes were really made by those Kings and Parliaments whose Names they bear? And are not altered or corrupted since? How shall we be sure? By a Natural Certainty from such Concurrent Testimonies as cannot be false; *viz.* 1. The Judges have still judged by them; and, 2. The Councillors plead them; 3. Justices and all Officers execute them; 4. All the People hold their Estates and Lives by them, and stand to the Determination made according to them; 5. The Records attest them. And it is not possible were they forged or corrupt, but that the Interests of Multitudes would have led them to plead that, and appeal from the Corruption: And yet none of these named are Supreme Governours of all the Kingdom, who thus Historically assure us.

4. It may be questioned, What is the Law of Nature? And it is known much by the Agreement of all Mankind, and that is known Historically: But neither of them is known by any Humane

mane Sovereign-Authority appointed to Govern all the World. And so it is in the present Case.

The Agreement of all Christians, Ministers and People, Friends and Adversaries, of contrary Opinions and Interests, contending against each other about the Rule of their Expositions, is a full Historical Evidence of Fact, when no considerable Contradiction, even of Jews or Heathens, is made against it.

5. It is notorious, 1. That regularly our first Reception both of Creed and Scripture, is by Gods appointment to be by Children from their Parents, before ever they hear a Preacher, *Deut. 6. and 11. Thou shalt teach them thy Children, lying down and rising up, &c.* And God will bless his appointed Means. *Timothy* learned the Scripture when he was a Child. If you say, Parents received it first from the Church: I answer, Our Parents regularly were to receive it as we did, even from their Parents, and they from theirs, and so on to those that had it from the Apostles, or first Preachers. And all Parents are not a Colledge of Sovereign Rulers of all the World.

2. And private Christians by Conference convert many. 3. And those that have not their Faith either of these ways, usually have it by the teaching of particular Presbyters where they dwell. And yet none of these are the Collective-Sovereign to all the Christian World; any more than Tutors in Law, Physick, or Theology are. Three and twenty Years ago I read most that you say in a *Paris Doctor H. Holden's Analys. S. fid.* who yet (though mixt with injurious passages against the S. Scripture) acknowledgeth, that it is by such an Universal Consent of all Christians, Lay and Clergy,

Clergy, that we receive the Scriptures, *that it is a Natural Historical Evidence* that the Matter of Fact is resolved into, and not of Supernatural Infallibility by Authority. 4. And when *Vinc-Lirinensis* turneth us to *quod ab omnibus ubique & semper receptum est*, and the Papists that go with *Holden* lay most on the Consent of *all Christians*, they never thought that the Laity through all the Christian World are one Universal Collective Sovereign. Nor do you think so of all the Consenting Priests, while you appropriate this *Collective-Sovereignty* to the Bishops.

6. I would know, whether it be only the *Scripture*, or also our *Christianity* and *Creed*, which must be received as from a Sovereign Church-Power? If you say it's only *Scripture*, why may we not receive the *Scripture* otherwise, if we may otherwise receive our *Christianity*, *Creed* and *Baptism*? But I doubt not but you will say, *It is both*. If so, then a Child (or Man) must know and believe that Christ hath authorized a Vicarious Sovereign Prelacy, before he can believe that there is a *Christ* that had any Authority himself. 2. And he must be so good a Casuist as to know what maketh a true Bishop. 3. And so well acquainted with all the World, as to know what parts of the Earth have true Bishops, and what they hold. And is this the way of making Christians?

Perhaps you will say, That Parents, Tutors and Priests tell them what all the Bishops of the World hold as a Sovereign Judicature. I answer, 1. If they did, *Holden* confesseth that the Certainty of Faith can be no greater than our Certainty of the *Medium*. And the Child, or Hearer, that knoweth not that his Parent and Teacher, therein

Faith

faith true, can no more know that the Creed or Scripture is true, on that account.

2. The generality of Protestants believe not an Universal-Governing-Sovereign under Christ, but deny it; Therefore they never Preach any such *Medium* of Faith: And can you prove that those that are brought to Christianity by Protestant Parents, Tutors or Preachers, are all yet Unchristened, or have no true Faith? 7. Why should we make Impossibilities necessary, while surer and easier Means are obvious? It is impossible to Children, to the Vulgar, to almost all the Priests themselves, to know certainly what the Major Vote of Bishops in the whole World, now think of this or that Text or Article, (save only consequently when we first believe the Articles of Faith, we next know that he is no true Bishop that denieth them.) And it is impossible to know that Christ hath authorized a Sovereign Colledge, before we believe Christs own Authority and Word. But the Protestant Method is obvious: viz. To hear Parents, Tutors and Preachers, as humble Learners: To believe them *Fide humana* first, while they teach us to know the *Divine Evidence* of Certain Credibility in the Creed and Scriptures; and when they have taught us that, to believe *Fide Divina*, by the Light of that *Divine Evidence* which they have taught us: What that is, I have opened as afore cited, and also in a small Treatise against the Papists, called, [*The Certainty of Christianity without Popery*;] in which also I have confuted your way: Besides what I have said in the Second Part of *The Saints Rest*,] and my [*More Reasons for the Christian Religion*.]

8. I cannot by all your Words understand how

you can have any Faith, on your Grounds. 1. You that renounce Popery, I suppose take not the Popish Prelates for any part of the Sovereign Colledge. 2. I perceive that you take not the Southern and Eastern Christians for a part, who are called *Nestorians*, *Eutychians* or *Jacobites*. 3. I find that you take not the Protestant Churches that have no Bishops for any part, (for the Sovereignty is only in Bishops.) 4. I find that you take not the *Lutheran Churches*, or any other, for a part, whose Bishops Succession from the Apostles hath not a Continuance uninterrupted, (which *Rome* hath not.) 5. And me thinks you should not think better of the Greeks than of such Protestants, on many accounts, which I pass by. Where then is that Universal Colledge on whose Judging-Authority you are a Christian? Sure you take not our little Island for the Universal Church. I would I knew which you take for the Universal Church, and how you prove the Inclusion and Exclusion.

9. I find not that the Universal Church hath so agreed as you suppose of the Canon of Scripture, and the Readings, Translations, &c. Four or five Books were long questioned by many; General Councils have not agreed of the Canon: Bishop *Consins* hath given us the best account of the Reception of the true Canon: Provincial Councils have said most of this. Even the fullest at *Laodicea* hath left out the *Revolutions*: The Romanists take in the *Apocrypha*: Many Churches have less or more than others: What *Grotius* himself thought of *Job* and the *Canticles*, I need not tell you: Nor how *Augustine* and most others strove for the *Septuagint* against *Jerome*: And if the

the Universal Judicature have decided the many Hundred Doubts about the Various Lectons, I would you would tell us where to find it; for I know not.

§. II. Your second Use of the *Sovereign Power*, is to judge of the Sense of *Fundamental Articles of Faith*; because the Words may be taken in a false Sense.]

1. This is very cautelously spoken: Is it only *Fundamentals* that they are to expound by Sovereign Judgment? How then shall we know the Sense of all the rest of the S. Scriptures? And how will this end a Thousand Controversies?

2. And why may not the same Means satisfie us about Fundamentals, which satisfieth us about the Integrals of Religion? Yea, we have here far better help. The first Christians Catechized and taught the Sense of Baptism before they were Baptized: They and their Tutors and Preachers taught the same to their Children, and so on: Baptism and the Fundamentals have been constantly repeated in all the Churches of the World. There are as many Witnesses or Teachers of these, as there are Understanding Christians. And yet must all needs hear from the *Antipodes*, or know the Sense of a Humane Sovereign of the World, before they receive them?

3. Can this Supreme Colledge speak the Fundamentals plainlier than God hath done, and than the Parish Priest can do? Are they necessary to tell us that Christ died, rose, ascended. because Scripture speaketh it not plain enough? We know that no Words of Creed or Scripture, falsely understood, make a true Believer. But is not that as true of a Councils Words, as of the Creed?

And

And are there any Words that Men cannot misunderstand? Why hath [*Filioque*] continued such a Distraction in the Churches, and Councils yet end it not? To say nothing of *Οὐτως*, and other such: Have we a necessity of a Sovereign Judicature, to be to all Men in stead of a School-master, to tell them what is the meaning of Greek and Hebrew Words? And could not one *Origen* or *Jerom* tell that better than a General Council of Men that understand not those Tongues? I must confess that what understanding of the Words of Creed or Scripture, I have received, was more from Parents, Tutors, Teachers and Books, than from Sovereign Councils, or Colledge of Bishops, (though Dr. *Holden* say he is no true Believer and Catholick that believeth an Article of Faith, because his Reason findeth it in Scripture, and not rather because all the Christian World believeth it.) There is more skill in Cosmography, Arithmetick, and History necessary to such a Faith, than I have attained, or can attain. I can tell *E. g.* by *Lexicons* and other Books what *αἰς* signifieth in the Creed, better than how all the Bishops in the World interpret it by an Authoritative Sentence.

§. III. Your third Work of this Sovereign Power is, [*Authoritatively to declare what Government of the Church was delivered by the Apostles.*]

1. As I said of Scripture, we know such Matter of Fact better by Universal Consent of all Christians, and true History, than by such a Judicature of all the Bishops of the V World. 2. But Protestants do so strongly prove that the S. Scripture is the entire Regulating V Word of God, without defect or supplement by Unwritten Tradition, as that

nothing is left out of it which is of Divine Obligation to all the Christian VVorld in all Ages : And therefore that all that the Spirit instituted as Universally Necessary in Church-Government, is there.

3. If it were not so, this Gap of Unwritten Necessary Supplemental Tradition, will let in, no Man knoweth what, besides Church-Power, on the like Pretences. 4. Tradition hath been oft pretended by General Councils against each other, (as I undertake to prove.) 5. All that is not in Scripture of Church-Offices and Government, have been so far new, or changed up and down, as proveth that the Church never took them as Universal Necessary Institutions of Christ delivered by the Apostles. I need not instance in Patriarcks, and such like, nor such difference of Seats as *Nazianzen* and *Isidore Pelusiot* a wish levelled ; when if General Councils themselves had been this Necessary Church-Government, the Church had not been Three Hundred Years without them, (yea, and to this Day indeed.)

6. As the King by his Laws, and by his Officers, Judges and Justices, Lawyers, &c. without another Vicarious Sovereign or Vice-King, doth tell the Subjects what is the Constituted Government of the Kingdom, and all Official Powers, which they must obey, so doth Christ by his Written Law, and by his Ministers teaching us in their several places, tell us what is his Church-Government, without an Universal Vicarious Sovereign.

7. When *Leo* the First called himself *Caput Ecclesie Universalis*, and *Boniface* was called *Universal Bishop*, (much more long after for many Hundred

dred Years) so great a part of the Empire judged the Roman Bishop to be the prime in the Empire, and in Councils, and *Principium Unitatis*, as Archbishop Bromhal speaketh, as that it seemeth then to have been the Major part of the Bishops of the whole World, the Empire being then the far greatest part of the Universal Church: And even *Salmasius* (liberally) granteth that the Pope was not a meer Patriarch, but the Heads of the Patriarchs and Church Universal (in the Empire) *de Eccles. Suburbicar. prope fin.* And I understand not how he is *Principium Unitatis* in a Governed Society as such, who is not *Principium Regens*. But it followeth not that it was so from the Apostles, nor that it must continue so when the Empire is overthrown, or the Emperor will change it. If most of the Church be in one Empire, and the Prince think he should form the Government to that of the State, (as the *Chalcedon* Council that magnified *Leo* yet witnesseth) doth this make one of his Subjects Ruler of all other Christian Kings, or subject the World to Foreigners? Yea, and that when the Empire and its Laws are overthrown, and most of the Church is without the Empire, enlarged more over other Lands. Must we turn Papists, if they can but prove that once a General Council, or the Major part of Bishops was for them by Corruption, or Secular Advantage? What Changes have the Majority oft made?

§. IV. Your fourth VVork of Universal Supremacy, is [To declare what Ordinances were received from the Apostles, as Imposition of Hands to give the Holy Ghost, and such others.

1. I acknowledge that Baptism and the Eucharist were known by practice before the New Testament

flament was written, and the continued practice hath been as sure a Tradition of the substance of them, as the Scripture it self hath had: But it is all Christians, Lay and Clergy, that assure us of this, yea Hereticks and Enemies with them, by Universal Historical Concord; and not the Authority of a Supreme Universal Judicature: And yet it was all recorded in the Scripture, that without those sure sufficient Records, the Tradition might not, as Oral or practical only, be continued. So that all that is Universally Necessary is now in Gods written Law. And, if it had not been so, the Papists changes of the Eucharist, (which yet *Holden* with others pleadeth Current Tradition for) tell us how little security we should have had of them. If there be more Sacraments than two in the Scripture, we will receive them: Or if more could be proved instituted by Christ, and delivered from the Apostles, than the Scripture mentioneth, we should not refuse them: But we are perswaded there is no such proof. The Papists plead Scripture for all their seven Sacraments; and we quarrel not at the Name, but expect better proof of all that is Obligatory to the whole Church on Earth, than an unproved Universal Judicature.

VVhat Confirmation is, I now pass by.

§. V. Your fifth VVork for the Sovereign Power is, *Judicial Sentencing* (not *Individuals* ordinarily, but) *by Description such as are to be cast out by Excommunication.*] 1. This is not part of Judicial Government, but Legislative: To say, [*He that is impenitent in Drunkenness or Heresie, shall be cast out,*] is the Penal part of the Law. And Gods Law hath already told us who shall be cast

cast out : There are Sins enough enumerated to this use.

2. If all the Necessary Doctrine and Practice be expressed in Scripture, then so is the Necessary Cause of Excommunication : For that Cause is [bringing other Doctrine, or Impenitence in breaking Gods Law. But the Antecedent is true : *Ergo*.

3. How happy had it been for the Church, if there had been no Hereticating or Anathematizing but for violating Scripture, Doctrine and Law impenitently ? Alas, what Work have Hereticians and Anathematizers made in the Church ?

4. How know we what Curses are valid, when General Councils have cursed *per Vices* almost all the Christian World ? And the same Bishops in one Council cursed one party, and in the next the contrary ; and cursed their own Councils.

5. As there needeth no Vicarious Monarch of the whole World, (no nor of one Kingdom under the King) to tell who shall be Fined or Hanged, but the Kings Law as the Rule, and the Judges and Justices in their several Limits to pass Sentence in particular Cases ; so there needs no Church-Vicarious-Judicature of all the Earth, to judge who shall be cursed and cast out : Christs Laws, and the Pastors respectively in the several Churches, are enough : And in doubtful Cases, and for Concord, Neighbor-Bishops in Synods must Consult.

§. VI. Your sixth Use of an Universal Supremacy, is to make mutable Church-Laws.

1. God is the only Lawgiver to all the World : Christ to all the Church. We deny any such Church on Earth as hath an Universal Sovereign

under Christ, and can make Laws for all the Christian World.

2. How is Gods Law sufficient *in ſuo Genere*, if it leave out that which is to be commanded to all the World of Christians? How is Mans Universal Legislative Power proved, (any more than an Universal Civil Sovereignty?) Or how differeth it from Gods?

3. Mutable Things are not of Universal Need or Use: These By-Laws (like those of Corporations) are only the Work of particular Churches or Countries. *E. g.* One Translation of Scripture, one Metre or Tune of Psalms, &c. will not fit all the World that have ſeveral Languages, &c.

Upon the whole, I am more confirmed by longer Considerations, 1. That to aſſert a Sovereign Vicarious Church-Power over all the Christian World, is to make a Church which Christ never made.

2. And Treasonably to ſet up an Uſurpation of his Prerogative.

3. And to plead for that which *de facto* never was in being.

4. And to lay the Ground of heinous Schiſm and Perſecution, by proſecuting impoſſible Terms of Concord and Communion,

5. And to make this the neceſſary *Medium* of our believing in Chriſt, or knowing his Word and Will, is to ſubvert the Chriſtian Faith and Scripture.

6. And as one Pope cannot poſſibly, through Natural Incapacity, Govern all the Earth in Religion, one Collective and Ariſtocratiſal Sovereign of all the Biſhops on Earth, is ſo incomparably more uncapable, that I wonder that any
Con-

Considerate Man can believe it. *Pighius* well tells us of the Novelty and Vanity of Heading all the Churches by General Councils.

7. And if the French, and the Councils of *Constance*, and *Basil*, and *Cassander*, and *Grotius*, and such Papists as set Councils over the Pope, had not taken in the Pope as the ordinary Governing, Executive Head, to Rule by the Councils Laws, they had been far more gross and incredible than the Italian Papists, who prefer the Pope.

8. And that Civil Government may so much easier be exercised by Officials than the Spiritual, that a Civil Monarch of all the Earth is far more congruous and possible, than a Humane Visible Church-Head under Christ, Personal or Collective.

9. That if this was the Principle from which you disputed at the *Savoy*, and in the *Convocation*, and from which our late Changes, and the silencing of Two Thousand Ministers have been made, it's no wonder that the Effects were such : But if ever we be healed, it must be by other Terms and Hands.

R. B.

Jan. 12. 1679.

This Feb. 13. Being with the Bishop again, he disclaimeth the Names of Supreme, *Summa Potestas Vicaria*, as Invidious, and chuseth the Name of [*a Ruling Collegium Pastorum Ministerialium*, who are the Church, which is the Mother which all must receive their Faith from and obey, and so must know their Consent.

Chap. XVIII. *The Fourth Letter to Bishop Guning.*

To the Lord Bishop of Ely. (Dr. Guning.)

My Lord,

THough I intended to trouble you no more by Writing, yet observing how apt you are to mistake me, and because time streightened our Discourse; Lest I be mistaken, and consequently mis-reported, I thus send you the sum of what I said to your last, as far as it concerned me.

I. Whereas you are offended at my Applicatory Conclusion, I must still say it, that [*If these were the Principles upon which our Changes were made by your Endeavour 1661 and 1662. it is no wonder that Two thousand Ministers were. Silenced and Cast out.*] And is it more offence to you to hear what you did towards it, than to them and their Flocks to suffer it? Is this impartiality?

II. My naming *Holden* as saying what you say, was not invidiously to intimate that you differ not from him in any thing else; but to tell you that these thoughts are not new to me, and that even a Papist pleading rather *Historical-Natural-Evidence in Universal Tradition*, than *judicial Authority*, in this is further from the common Papists than you.

III. You are offended at my comparing *Bishops* to *Kings* only in this respect, that they both govern only their proper Provinces, and neither are

‘Rulers

'Rulers of all the World : And your reason is,
'because it intimateth that Bishops rule like
'Kings.

Who can Dispute on these terms ? Did I not
in the stating of our Question agree, that it is not
the Power of the Sword, but only Ecclesiastical
Power of the Word and Keys, that we Dispute
of ? Did I not still profess to you to speak only
of this ? And doth comparing Princes Coactive
Government with it, only in the *extent*, neither
of them being *over all the World*, contradict this,
or wrong you by unjust intimations ?

IV. You take the words ["*Aristocratical-
Supream Vicarious, under Christ, Legislative*] to
"be invidious, and you disown them ; 1. Be-
"cause they intimate a *forcing Power* like Princes,
"2. Because Christ only is Supream.

But 1. It is not *de nomine* that we dispute, but
de re ; and I understand all this while that we had
no other question to debate.

2. I desired still nothing more than that you
would state your assertion in your own words,
that I might use no other : You tell me your own
words are [*Collegium Pastorum*] I tell you again,
that nameth only the subject Matter of the Power,
where our question is *de formâ*, what is their Power
which we must obey.

You next tell me ["*It is a College of Pastors
having a Ministerial, Ruling, Judicial Power over
the Universal Church*] I take up with your own
words : Only remember that before you asserted a
Legislative Power (of mutable Laws) and now it is
but *Judicial* ! If so, then we owe no Obedience to their
Laws, but to their *Sentence* according to Christ's
Law : How then is obeying them the only way of
Concord ? But

But say you, *It is but mutable Laws that they make?* Answ. And are mutable Laws no Laws. And is he no *Legislator* that maketh but mutable Laws? Neither King nor Parliament will believe this.

But you say, *Canons are not Laws.* I thank you for that Concession. So saith *Grotius de Imp. sum. Potest.* If so, then they are but either *Counsels* or *Agreements*, (Contracts.) It is not *de nomine* that we contend. A Law, saith *Grotius*, is *Regula actionum Moralium*: More fully, *A Law is the signification of a Ruler's Will making the Subjects Duty.* If a Canon be none, then *Literæ formatae* are none: And where there is no Law, there is no Transgression. Then no *Obedience* is due to the Laws of the College of Bishops. And then obeying them is not the only way of Concord. *Autoritas imperantis est objectum formale Obedientiae*: you disown also the word (*Pars imperans*) I take your own [*Pars Regens*] which to me is of the same Signification as to Ecclesiastical Power. *Jus regendi* is that which I mean by *Authority*, and *Debitum Obediendi*, by Subjection. But I think that indeed authorized Pastors may make proper Laws, e.g. At what Places and Hours to meet: what Translations, Version, Metre, and such Orders to use; but only to their proper Subjects, and not to all the Christian World.

V. "You Copiously blame us for denying that
"Obedience to the Universal Church, which we
"give to every single Pastor; and thought that I
"owned no Power but Parochial.]

I tell you still, 1. I maintain that there were in the first Age (and perhaps except two Churches, for the second Age and more) no Bishops distinct from

from *Archbishops* but *Parochial*, and I described them at large.

2. But though *Cyprian* and the *Carthage* Council said, *Nemo nostrum se dicit Episcopum Episcoporum*; yet I deny not such as may be called *Archbishops*. Would you but restore *Parish Churches*, or at least make true *Discipline* a practicable thing, I should never quarrel against your Government.

3. I still tell you that I am for Councils, and that as large when requisite as they can well be made. And Pastors there agreeing, oblige us to obey their true Authority far before a single Pastor's: For it is *Authoritas Doctoris*? and it is *Discipuli Obsequia* that is due: And a Teacher's Authority is founded in his *Credibility*, and that on his *Skill*; *Oportet discipulum credere*: And a thousand Historians, Philosophers, Physicians agreeing, oblige me to greater belief than a single one. And a Dissenters singularity obligeth me to suspicion and suspension of my belief. Besides, that God bindeth us to do his work in as much Love and Concord as we can: And the Canons or Agreements of Councils when Just do determine the Matter of that Concord.

4. But that which I still repeat to you, is, that I deny the being of any such Church as you tell me I must necessarily obey; That is, one Ruling Ministerial College of Pastors over the whole Christian World. I remember no Protestants that own such a thing but you, and some such of late. Mr. *Thorndike* and Mr. *Dodwell* do imply it, but they speak not fully out. What an unedifying way of Discourse is it for you so Copiously to call out for our Obedience, when we only desire you to prove that there is any such Governing College

College to obey? I deny the subject of your Question, and you largely prove the Predicate. If you would spend many hours to tell me, I must obey *Gabriel* the Angel as the Ruler of this Kingdom, I only beg of you to prove that he is such a Ruler, and then to tell me how I shall know his Mind; will your Exhortation to Obedience profit me?

VI. Your Copious instances of difficult Texts of Scripture that need a sure Exposition, are no Proof to me, that *Ergo* There is a College of all the Bishops on Earth that must be the Expositor. I told you the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* was not so resolved of the sense of *Isai. 53.* It was not the Ancient way. A single Teacher may resolve a Doubter by *Expository Evidence.* An agreeing Provincial or National Council may do more without knowing the Mind of all the World; And many Texts will be difficult when all the World have done their best.

VII. But you urge that no *Scripture* is of private Interpretation.

A. 1. All is not *Private* Interpretation, which is made by Persons, Pastors or Councils, which are not a *College* authorized to Rule all the Christian World (or Church.) If it be, 1. I confess I never received one Article of my Faith, or Exposition of one Text of Scripture aright: For I never believed one of them upon [the *Authoritative-Ruling-Judicial-Universal* Power of all Bishops on Earth as an authorized College.] 2. And I know not one Man living then that expoundeth not Scripture by Private Interpretation; 3. And I know not that any one these Fifteen hundred Years have not done the same.

2. And

2. And it is certain that there is no Commentary on the Scripture yet written by the Universal College of Bishops ; And it's harder to deliver it down by Memory than by Writing. ~

Therefore all Scripture is in this sence of Private Interpretation ; yea , such Councils as are called General , have expounded little more than the Articles of the Creed (with sad dissention as to their Votes.)

But I confidently think that you follow a wrong Exposition of the Text, and that it speaketh not of [*an Efficient Interpretation*] but [*an Objective, a Passive, and not an Active*] Q. d. you must not interpret Scripture Prophecies narrowly and privately, as if they spake but of such or such a private Person, that was but a present typical object of them : For holy Men spake as moved by the Spirit, which looked farther , and meant Christ to come] *e. g.* you know how many Prophecies are meant of *David* and *Solomon* proximately, and of Christ ultimately. And you know what *Grotius* thinks of the proximate sence of [*A Virgin shall bring forth a Son.*] And of *Isa. 53, &c.* which yet ultimately by the Holy Ghost is meant of Christ ; and whether the Prophet himself knew it always, many doubt : *Josias* or *Jeremy* may be meant as types , and yet Christ Principal as typified : when *David* saith , *My God , why hast thou forsaken me ? They pierced my hands and my feet : They divided my garments among them , and cast lots for my vesture, &c.*) and so many Texts cited by *St. Matthew*, these are to have no *Private Interpretation* as of the private Persons, only the first Objects ; for the Holy Ghost-intended them to be Prophecies of Christs] when you bring me any

Litera

Literæ formatæ from all the Bishops on Earth for another fence, the reverence of their Concord will do much to make me forsake this.

Just so the Papists, and too many others distort that 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. (which I wonder that I heard not from you) when the Text plainly calleth the Church, The House of the living God, and telleth Timothy how to behave himself in it, as a Pillar and Basis of the Truth; it is but putting [*The Pillar*] for [*a Pillar*] and then saying, that it is not the title of Timothy, but of the Church, and so it becometh useful to some mens Opinions.

Therefore still that which I am more confirmed in by your failing to prove your Affirmative, is [*That there never was instituted, and never was* "existent, and is not now existent in the World any "one Ecclesiastical Ruling Persona Collectiva Civilis "or Governour authorized by Christ to Rule under "him all the Christian World, (that is, all the Church) "by Legislation and Judgment, or either of them, and "to Constitute the Universal Church visible, as one by "relation to that One Governour; Especially that all the Bishops on Earth Governing *per literas formatas* never were, nor are such a Power, nor yet as Congregate in an Universal Council.] If such a College of all Bishops on Earth, ruling all the Christians on Earth by Consent, be the Church which you mean that all must obey that will have Concord, I say, There is no such Church on Earth, nor ever will be before the Day of Judgment.

After all this sure you cannot mistake the Question, 1. It is only of an Ecclesiastical Power by the Word and Keys. 2. It is not whether all Bishops ruling by Parts in their several Provinces, and

and keeping Concord in convenient Meetings or Councils may be said to Govern all the Church (as all the Magistrates in *England* Govern all *England* in Subordination to the King.) But it is of One *Persona Ecclesiastica* in whom the Church is relatively called *One*, as *Venice* is one Commonwealth with relation to one Supream Senate, which ruleth the whole.

1. Shew me any *Literas formatas* of all Bishops in the World before the Council of *Nice*, yea, or ever since to this day ?

2. What need the Council meet, if all Bishops could know each others Mind and Consent without it, *e. g.* Did they all agree about *Easter-Day* before ? Or about the extent of Patriarchs Jurisdictions. 3. There was never a General Council in the World ; It was called General only as to one Empire : The Emperors that called them, had no Power elsewhere : The Subscriptions shew you that none other came ; yea, and but a part of the Empire. Few out of the West were at any great Councils.

4. Heticks have had as great Councils as ever had the Orthodox, and as much Consenting. And the disallowed have been as great as the approved ; *Sola navicula Petri*, as I said out of *Binnius* escaped Drowning at *Eph. 2.*

5. There never must nor will be an Universal Council of all the Church hereafter, as I have elsewhere proved, And is the Universal Regent Ministerial Church extinct these Thousand Years ? How can we obey a Power that is not ?

6. But you say, I confess that the *Roman Empire* was seven Parts of the Church : *Answ.* Your haste overlooked my exception of the Empire of *Abassia*,

sia, which *Brierwood* faith, is now as great as *Italy*, *Germany*, *France* and *Spain*: and was incomparably greater heretofore; And you may gather from *Damianus a Goes*, *Alvarez*, and especially *Godignus de rebus Abassinorum*, that, they had Christianity from the Eunuch mentioned *Act. 8*. And it's certain that their case was much unknown to *Rome* it self, till the *Portugals* and *Oviedo's* late access. And though now they give some Preeminence to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, that is but since the Banishment of *Nestorius* and *Dioscorus*, who thereupon carried the Interest of their Parties without the Empire into other Lands. Of *Abassia* see more in *Ludolphus* since come out.

7. Either this *Unum Collegium Omnium Episcoporum* must rule the Church Universal by a Major Vote, or by Consent of all Bishops in the World. If the former, where shall they meet to Vote? who shall gather them? how many Years or Ages will it be doing? How shall all Christians know that they are truly gathered? Shall we, till we know the Major Vote of all Bishops on Earth, suspend our Obedience? and have no Faith, no Concord till then? If all must Consent, or almost all, the case will be still harder, how to procure, and how to know it: May the Heretick keep his Heresie till all the Bishops on Earth condemn him *per literas formatas*, or otherwise? When *e. g.* the Nestorians or Eutychians or Monothelites have the greater number of Bishops one Year or Age, and the lesser the next; Is Bishops Consent the determining ruling Power?

8. Either this One ruling Church is necessary in all Ages, or only in some, or at least the exercise

Use of their Power : If in all, the Church is extinct or ungoverned, either these 1500 Years, except during your Six Councils, or all the time that we have had no Universal Government by them : If but in some Ages, why not in the rest as well ? And is not the Church still the same thing *in specie*, and for the same use and ends.

VIII. You say all Heresies are Condemned already. *Answ.* 1. Yes, Virtually by God's Word, *Rectum est index sui & Obliqui.* 2. But if you say *Actually* in their form, How great is your Mistake ! The Devil could invent a Thousand more yet. My long Catalogue of Errors to be forbidden in my Book of the Churches Concord will tell you of enow that are too possible.

2. If the use of your Ruling Church ended so long ago, why doth not the Church end ? or how are we to be Governed by it, when it doth not Govern ? I never heard from it since I was born by any *Litera formata*. To say, I must obey the old Canons, is to say I must obey a Government that was, and not one that now is and Governeth. The Pope I could possibly send to : Old Councils I can read : But how to hear from a College of all the Bishops on Earth, that never see or hear of one another or me, and that are broken into so many Sects, I know not. I have my self, with some Wise and Able Divines, Pleaded the Cause that you Plead for, to try what they could say to me : And they answer me with Laughter, as if I were Distracted for talking of all being Governed by all the Bishops on Earth, as one ruling College by Consent or Vote.

IX. You lay much stress on the Church, being (our Mother). And Solomon saying, [Obey the Law

of thy Mother] *Answ.* 1. You may possibly believe that Solomon by [Mother] meant an universally Governing College of Bishops] but when will you prove it? 2. You cannot name one Text that I know of that calleth the Church [our Mother] Except Gal. 4. 26. And there 1. You suppose that by [Hierusalem which is above] is meant the Church which is on Earth: which I know many others think: But it is uncertain. 2. And when will you prove that by Hierusalem, is meant your Ruling College. 3. Or that it speaketh of any one Universal Government. The word [Mother] is a Metaphor: And Similitudes prove nothing but the Point of Assimilation. The Text expressly saith that It is called our Mother, because she hath many Children. But these Children are not begotten by All the Bishops in One Voting College, as Universal Rulers, but by particular Pastours. And so that one Church of Christ hath many begotten and ruled *per partes*.

X. You still lay much on [The Nation that will not serve thee, shall Perish.] And you bring three or four Fathers to prove that spoken of the Christian Church. And you say still the Church is no where taken for Christ.

I answer, 1. As the Kingdom includeth the King and Magistrates as the only Governours, so doth the Church include Christ and his Ministers: 2. I believe that it is meant of the Universal Church: But three Fathers Interpretation or threescore is a Private one compared to your College. 3. All Power is given to Christ: Princes are his Ministers. Infidels that are Converted to serve the Church, must serve Christian Magistrates as well as Bishops. And it's as likely to be

be specially meant of Magistrates : For Bishops destroy not the Disobedient, nor so much as Excommunicate the Infidel World : What have we to do to Judge them that are without ? But Princes conquer and destroy resisting Enemies. So that this Text will no more prove One ruling Collège of Bishops over all, than one Monarch or College of Kings to rule all the World ; nor so probably.

4. The Nations serve the Church, 1. When they Obey the King of all the Church, 2. and his Universal Laws. 3. And his Officers ruling *per partes* in their several Provinces by Word and Sword. 4. And serve the good of the whole, as the end of Government : Stretch the words on any Rack that is not against reason, and besides these four, you can never prove one Universal ruling College.

XI. You say, *God is not the visible Head of the World, and Men have access to Kings, but not to Christ.*

Answ. God is the King or Supream Governor of all the World ; and you have no more visible access to the Father than to the Son : And particular Pastors are as accessible as Kings : And Church Government, which like a Physitian, or Tutor, depends on personal Skill, may much less be performed by absent Men at the Antipodes, than Civil Government.

XII. But it's said, [*It is the whole Churches reception of Canons, though Councils be not properly Universal, that maketh the Obligation Universal.*]

Answ. If they bind not by the Imposers Power, they were not received as binding Universally : If Reception be the Obligatory Act, Subjection

is Government, and Lay Men and Women govern by receiving. And I have proved how mutable and how uncertain Reception is: They say all the Church was against Adoration by genuflexion on the Lord's Day, and for Milk and Honey, and the white Garment in Baptism: And yet particular Churches laid them down before any Universal Judicature allowed it.

XIII. Qu. *If you know that all the Bishops of the World receive any Doctrine or Practice as needful or good, will not you do so too? and do you not so receive the Creed and Bible?*

Ans. 1. I receive the Laws of the Land only as authorized by the Law-givers: But I know them to be the same Laws that the King and Parliament made, by the concurrent Testimony and Use of all Judges, Lawyers and People of the Land, (and Proclamation by the Proclaimers) But I know them not by my obeying all these Judges, Justices and People as one authorized College, that is under the King to Govern the whole Land: So here, I know the Writings of *Homer, Virgil, Cicero*, to be theirs the more confidently by Universal Tradition: But not because I believe that all the Witnesses in the World that have so received them, are Commissioned to be Rulers or a Judicature to the World; I receive Divine Truths as Delivered in the Creed and Scriptures, as from Christ and his Apostles, especially Commissioned and qualified to teach all Men whatever he commanded them, and this by the hand of my Parents and Pastors; and since I understood History common consent puts me the more out of doubt of the Matter of Fact, that these are their true Writings and Doctrines: But not from the Bishops,

shops ; as one College Commissioned to rule all the World or Church on Earth. And alas, how few are so well verst in History as to know much of this.

To know what is received now *ab omnibus ubiq;* is too hard : But to know the *semper* is much harder especially when the *Filioq;* and the *Debrun*, and many such like, have had more for them in one Prince's Reign, and more against them in another, and so off and on ; and to know which had most was impossible, to most Christians : How few know at this day whether the [*Filioq;*] have more for it, or against it? Not I, nor any Traveller that I have spoke with.

XIV. " But you would not for a World be guilty of saying what I have written of Councils ; 1. As if they were to be abhorred for their Faults. 2. You say, How great Matters the Articles of two Natures and Wills and of one Person are, and no small nor wordy difference.

Answ. 1. I can mention Mens Faults without abhorring them, I honour them for their good, and am for the use of needful modest Councils of good Men.

2. I doubt not but the Matters determined were weighty : But how far Persons wronged and misunderstood one another, and strove about words when they meant the same thing, I have not nakedly said, but proved to you. When *Theodosius* forced by threatening *Cyril* and *Johannes Antioch.* and *Theodoret* to agree, did they not confess that they had wrongfully *anathematized* each other, and were of one Mind, and did not know it? Have I not proved to you that *Nestorius* denied two Persons? and that *Cyril* off asserteth but one Nature

ture after the Union? Do you indeed think that [One] and [Two] are words that have but one signification? Have I not proved the Ambiguity, and the Misunderstanding of each other in too many? But O how hard it is to be Impartial and to Repent, when Contentious Bishops in Councils have notoriously torn the Churches, drawn streams of Blood, Cursed and Reproached one another, and Cursed that Cursing it self and their Party the next change, and have overthrown the Empire, and set up the Pope by striving about Jurisdiction and hard words, who shall be greatest and wisest, must not this which cannot be hid be lamented? If Cyril were but half as bad as *Joh. Antioch. Theodoret, Isidore, Pelusiotas, Socrates and Sozomen, &c.* make him, how partial were his Admirers? But I see it is as hard for Bishops to repent as other Men, when their Self-esteem and Dignity seemeth to themselves to entitle them to the reputation of Sanctity and Innocency: And if they divide the Christian World as wofully as the West and East, and the Abassines, Copties, Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians, Protestants, &c. are divided at this day, or should they Silence Thousands of Faithful Ministers of Christ for not Sinning, or for Nothing, and bring thereby Confusion and Schisms, among serious Christians to the hardening of the Prophané and Hereticks, it will seem to some a more heinous Sin to name their Sin, and call them to Repentance, than in them to commit it. And yet one may name the Sins of a Thief or Drunkard, and call him to Repentance without blame. But have I said half so ill by them, as they said by one another? They anathematized each other, but so do not I by them; What say I worse of the first and best

best of your Six Councils than *Eusebius* and *Constantine* said of them, when he burnt their accusing Libels against each other?

2. What say I worse of the first Council at *Constantinople* than *Greg. Nazianzen* saith? I do but recite his words and the History? Did they not set him up in the beginning, and pull him down at the end? (and for what)?

3. What say I of the first *Ephes.* Council but what the recorded Acts do tell us? How they divided into two Parts, and each Excommunicated the Leaders of the other, and the Orthodox Part fought with the other notwithstanding the Endeavours of the Emperor's Lieutenant to have kept the Peace; and yet when they had done, found that they had been of one Mind, and knew it not, (except *Nestorius*.) And how much hand a Woman had in it against him, the History tells us.

4. Have I said so much against that at *Chalcedon* as the many Councils that anathematized them did? or more than they said of themselves when they cried *Omnes Peccavimus* for Voting with *Dioscorus* and the Eutychians at Council *Eph. 2.* I would fain know, when as the greater Part of the Empire and Church was against this Council, in the days of *Zeno*, *Basiliscus*, and *Anastasius*, by what means every Christian should then have known the sense of the Universal Church. At *Jerusalem* the Orthodox rebelliously resisted the Emperor's Lieutenants, and put them to flight in defence of this Council (following a Monk that compared the four Councils to the four Evangelists) and sent the Emperor word that they would spend their Blood for it: And yet even there, be-

fore, the prevailing Part had condemned it. At *Antioch* the Bishop and Monks fought it out to so much Blood, that the Monks Carcasses could have no Grave but the River *Orontes* : At *Constantinople* and *Alexandria* the Matter oft was little better. Are these things indifferent or jesting Matters of small Infirmary?

5. And the 5th General Council *Const.* 2. was thought long by a great Part of the Church to have contradicted the 4th *de tribus Capitulis*, and was so much disowned, that even *Venice, Liguria, Istria, &c.* renounced the Pope and Roman Primacy for Owning it, and chose a Patriarch at *Aquileia* to be the Primate instead of *Rome*, which long continued, till *Sergius* reconciled them.

6. And that *Concil. Trullanum* called *Quino-Sextum* which you own as the same with the Fifth, is disowned by the Roman Party to this day, and accused by them to have been Monothelites. (Vid. *Binnium*) And yet said to be the same Men who were the Second *Const.* Council; And so they make that Second also to have been Monothelites.

6. And the next, *Const.* Third were condemned by the Seventh General at *Nice*, as heinous Sinners for condemning Church Images, and even *Helvius*, with other Lutherans, call it *Synodum Iconomachicam quam Occumenicam dici voluerunt*. And I think that the Church of *Rome* disowneth the Doctrine both of it and the Second of *Nice*, which hath agreed that Christ's Body is not flesh in Heaven.

Now I would know while these Councils thus anathematized each other, or lamented their own former Errors, as Voting by Fear or Mistake, and

and while most of the Bishops declared against any of them as they oft did, and when *Heraclius*, *Philippicus* or other Emperors were Monothelites, and the Major part of the Bishops followed them, how common Christians should know whom to Obey.

XV. I remember that you also pleaded Christ's words, *Hear the Church*] But he saith also, [*Tell the Church*] even the same Church which we must Hear. And verily here I am utterly at a loss. Christ I know and *Paul* I know should be heard, but who are this one Universally ruling College for me to to hear? yea, the Pope may be told and heard; but how to tell or hear a College that dwell all over the Earth, I know not, I cannot hope to live long enough to send to, or hear from *Abassia*, *Armenia*, *Syria*, *Mengrelia*, *Georgia*, *Circassia*, and all the Greek Churches, and to *Mexico*, and perhaps the *Antipodes*; nor do I think our Salvation lyeth so much on our Skill in Geography, that we must know that there are any such Countries in the World, nor a *Rome* or a *Constantinople*, &c. And I cannot think that most of the World, will ever hear that there is such a Man as I in being; nor that one of a thousand of the Bishops ever hear the Names, or know the Opinions of all the rest, or of the one half of them: And if I were rich enough to hire a Messenger to go all over the Earth, and were so foolish as to hope to live till he returned, I must take their Votes on the Credit of the Messengers Word, which is a sandy Ground for Church-Communion and Salvation. Nay, I cannot hope to live to see a General Council, much less to see the end of it,
and

and to be certain of their Votes and Sentence : And if I knew that I had all the Bishops on Earth for one Opinion, I am not certain whether most of the Presbyters (being an hundred to one) be not against them ; and in *England* the Presbyters are part of the Convocation, which is the Representative Church. Had I lived on Earth when the Council of *Nice* was contradicted at *Sirmium*, *Ariminum*, *Tyre*, *Milan*, and the World groaned to find it self turned *Arrian* : Or when they were Anathematizing each other, and fighting at the first *Eph.* Council : Or when the 2d *Nicene* were condemning the second *Const.* Or when *Vigilius* was dragged by a Rope at *Const.* by *Justinian's* Command, and the Patriarch of *Aquiteia* set up against *Rome* ; or when the *Trull.* Canons were made by Men now called *Monothelites* ; or when innumerable *Monothelite* Bishops met under *Philippicus*, &c. I could not possibly have told how to know the Governing Judgment of the College of Bishops that live all over the Earth. Nay, when you own no Council since the Sixth, why will no Importunity intrait you to tell me, whether for these Thousand Years last the Universal Church was Governed by one College, and what Governing Act this College hath so long exercised over all the Christian World ? And how it was known ? And whether their *Literæ formatae* are to be found written ? And where ? Or are only transmitted to all the World by Memory ? and by whose Memory ? and of whom we may all enquire of them with certain Satisfaction ? Or whether the Church hath been this Thousand Years no Church, or Ungoverned.

You say the Council at Frankford condemned that

at Nice : How shall I know which the College owned at the time of the sitting of each Council ? How few Councils were ever so great as that at *Nicæ* ? Can you tell me how to be sure whether the College be more for it or against it at this day ?

Bear with me for telling you, that if I had not found that you are a Man of *strong Passions, & full of your self*, and of *undoubting Confidence in your Apprehensions*, I should wonder how so Studious, Learned and Sober a Man could possibly take either Union, Communion, or Salvation, to lie upon Men's Belief of, and Obedience to such a College as all the Bishops on Earth : And if you take the Creed to mean this as the Holy Catholick Church, I shall not wonder if you take me, [and almost all the Protestants that ever I knew or read,] for Hereticks ; and having twice admonished me, and not convinced me, if you avoid me, and should not only Seventeen Years silence me, but banish or burn me, if you are for such execution upon Hereticks ; or at least take me, and all such as I, to be intolerable, and use us accordingly.

XVI. I will sum up the Difference between you and me in a Similitude. All Power in Heaven and Earth, and all Judgment is given to Christ. The Creator's Government by Civil Rulers he changeth not, but is now their Sovereign King. His Church he Governeth as a Saviour and a Teacher, and their Heavenly High Priest : It is his School, and we are his Disciples ; I suppose that God the Father and Christ is the only Rightful, Universal, Civil and Church-Monarch, and none else can give Laws, or exercise Judgment over the whole Earth ; but that Magistrates and
Pastors

Pastors are Commissioned by God to their several Provinces, Governing the whole only *per partes* between them; and God, as the Monarch, maketh them such Universal Laws as they must Rule and be Ruled by. And that there is no more proof of one Ecclesiastick Humane Judicature to Rule all the World, than of one Civil one, and less probability: But that Princes and Pastors must do all by the best Advantages of Unity, Love and Concord, and keep such Synods and Correspondencies as are necessary to that end; I suppose that every Kingdom hath its own King and Inferiour Magistrates Ruling by their several Courts and Circuits, and by the Kings Laws; but not Ruling all the Kingdom as one College of a Voting Synod of Judges, Justices and Majors. If Senates have any where a Supremacy, it is from the peculiar Constitution of that Commonwealth; and there is no Institution of a College of Kings (or one Monarch) to Rule all the Earth: But their Unity is centred in God that is one.

I suppose that the King hath ordained that all Free-Schools in *England, Scotland and Ireland*, shall have each their proper Schoolmasters, one to a small School, and to a great one a Chief Master, with under Schoolmasters; and he hath made an Order that they shall teach *E. g. Lilly's Grammar*, and faithfully perform their Trust, or be put out by them that have the Power: And if any School-Difficulty occur, they may do well to consult for their Mutual Help.

But you seem to add, *g. d.* as if, 1. All the World is one Humane School, though under several Kings. 2. None is a Member of this School that is not under the College of Schoolmasters
that

that dwell all over the World, and never know one another, and that doth not live in Obedience to that College. 3. All these Schoolmasters of the whole World must meet by themselves or Delegates in General Councils. 4. All Schools must receive Canons from these Councils, and be judged by them, and bring their Accusation (at least Appeals) to them, from all Nations of the Earth. 5. All the Schoolmasters of the several Kingdoms must hold National Assemblies in those Kingdoms [or Provinces] as a College of Governors to the whole Land. 6. A Thousand, or many Hundred or Scores Local particular Schools must be Schools but equivocally so called, and have all but one proper Schoolmaster, who alone must have the Keys of them, and judge of each Scholar that is, 1. admitted, 2. corrected, 3. or put out. 7. All these Schools under this Diocesan Schoolmaster shall have his Ushers, (and no proper Schoolmasters) who shall have Power to teach those that will learn, and to tell the proper Schoolmaster, (perhaps One Hundred, Eighty or Twenty Miles off) of every Boy that deserveth to be corrected or put out. But none of these Ushers shall have Power, 1. To judge whom to take or refuse, or what Boys to correct, nor to correct them till commanded by the Diocesan Master: 3. Nor to put out any till he bids him: 4. Nor to forbear correcting or casting out any when commanded, though he know them to be the best.

I think this, 1. Deposeth all the Inferiour Schools, and robs them of proper Schoolmasters, which are their due. 2. And deposeth the Ushers, that should be mostly Schoolmasters. 3. And maketh Schooll-Government an impossible thing, while

while one only in a Diocess is to use that which he cannot do. 4. And thereby overthroweth Learning, and introduceth Barbarousness. 5. And bringeth in a new sort of Diocesan Schoolmasters, who will undo the Scholars and themselves by undertaking Impossibilities.

But I disallow not, 1. A Chief Schoolmaster in each School. 2. Nor needful Overseers or Visitors to see that all Schoolmasters do their Duty. 3. Nor that the King and Justices keep them all to their Duty, and make Laws that they truly teach the Sacred Scriptures, and correct those Schoolmasters who by their Insufficiency, or Unfaithfulness deserve it.

Again, I tell you, 1. Make us no Universal Governor but Christ. 2. And restore the Power of necessary Discipline to the Parish-Churches, or at least make Christs Church-Discipline a possible practicable thing, and you will reconcile many Nonconformists to you. But to say only one Schoolmaster, with meer Teaching-Ushers, shall Govern many Hundred Schools, or one Bishop many Hundred Churches, or rather Oratories and Chappels that are made but parts of one true Church *infima speciei*; this is in English to say, that there shall be no considerable Government of such Schools or Churches at all, and to put it down on pretence of having the Power to do it. And yet by the Charity and Justice of many that now Write and Preach against us, we are all unruly, intolerable, rebellious Schismatics, and against Bishops, for desiring more Bishops, at least one to every *Heads*, or Corporation, that Discipline might be a possible thing, I have in many Years (of Liberty) tryed without Rigour so much

as all Church-Canons agree to be necessary, in a Congregation that had not Three Thousand Souls, and was unable for it with the assistance of Three Presbyters, when one Parish about London hath Thirty Thousand, and Forty Thousand, if not Sixty Thousand Souls, and most, or many, far less Governable.

XVII. The Essentials of the Sacred Office are, 1. Power or Right; 2. Obligation to; 3. The Work. 1. The Work, you say, is to Rule the Church Universal on all the Earth, not only separately *per partes*, but as *Unum Collegium*, which is *Una Persona Politica*. 2. The Power is *Jus Regendi*. 3. The *Obligation* maketh it their Duty.

The Apostles were sent first to Preach the Gospel to every Creature, or all Mankind, and make them Christians; and after to Teach them all Christs Doctrine and Law, and to Rule them by Pastoral Guidance thereby.

2. If the College of Bishops be their Successors, are they bound to that Work *in uno Collegio*, which the Apostles did each one apart? That is, deliver Christs Commands, and guide the Churches. If, yea, are they not bound *in uno Collegio*, to Preach to all the Heathen World? And then, are they not guilty of the Damnation of most of the World for not so Preaching to them?

3. If you say that it is only a Regiment that they must do in *uno Collegio*, or *per Literas formatas*, do you not make the whole Pastoral Church guilty of perfidious Negligence, (as a Pastor would be, that never guided his Flock) for not at all performing any such Government? What one Act of Government hath the College performed in our Age? or in the Age foregoing? or in any Age according

ding to your self since *Constant. Pogonatus* his sixth (or seventh) Council? And was it only the Church of those Ages that was bound to Govern? Then it was they only that were *Authorized*, or had the Office and Power: For *Obligation* to the Work (though not *ad hic & nunc*) is Essential to the Office as well as Authority: Or will the Performance of the Bishops of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries excuse all that succeed them to the end of the World from any Performance? Why then not from all Pastoral Guidance? And are they not then degraded?

XVIII. We are against Singularity in Matters of Faith: We believe that all Christs Church shall never err from any one Essential of Christianity or Communion; else it would thereby cease to be a Church: But we believe General Councils (such as the Empire had) have erred so far as to condemn each other of Heresie. We perswade all Men to believe as the Church believeth; that is, to receive that from the Apostles, *quod ab omnibus ubique & semper receptum fuit*, which the Church received and delivered as from them with known common Consent, and to suspect odd Opinions, Novelties and Singularities.

But Protestants against Papists commonly use these Distinctions: 1. *Authority* of a Governor by Legislation, and Judgment, or either, is one thing. 2. *Doctoral Authority* (like a Philosopher in a School of Consenters) is another. 3. The Authority of *Witnesses* (which is their *Obliging Credibility*) is another. 4. The Authority of a *Steward*, or Keeper of *Records*, is another. 5. The Authority of a *Herald*, or *Cryer*, or *Messenger*, (to publish Laws) is another. 6. And the Authority of

Contractors

Contractors in Mutual Self-Obligation, is another.

Accordingly they hold, 1. That there is no one Universal Head, Governour, or *Summa Potestas Ecclesiastica*, to Rule the whole by *Legislation* or *Judgment*, *Personal* or *Collective*, but *Christ*.

2. That there is no one Person, Natural or Political, that is bound or authorized to be the Teacher of the whole World or Church; but that all Pastors must Teach and Guide in their several Provinces.

3. That the larger and more uncontrouled the Testimony is, the greater is the Credibility and Authority of the Witnesses: And therefore if all the Churches in the World, as far as we can learn, agree, *de facto*, that these are the Books, Doctrines, and practised Ordinances which they received; and especially when Hereticks or Infidels, and Enemies that would gainsay it, cannot with any probability, we thus receive the said Books and Practices, (as Baptism, &c.) *ex Autoritate Testium*, and not *ex Autoritate Judicis Regentis*; or else Lay-Men, (such as *Origen*, when he was a more credible Witness of the Text than an Hundred unlearned Bishops, and such as *Hierom*, that was no Bishop, of whom I say the same) yea, and Women, yea Hereticks and Infidels, (such as *Pliny*, &c.) would be Church-Rulers.

4. All Pastors being by Office to Preach Christ's Word, and Ministerially Officiate accordingly, are thereby especially intrusted with the keeping of these Sacred Records, as Lawyers while they daily use them, are with the Laws, and the Universal Testimony of such Officers is the most credible part of the Witnesses Work; or if not U-

niversal, the more the better. 5. Every Pastor is as a Cryer to proclaim Christ's Laws. 6. And in Circumstances left to Mutable Humane Determination, the more common *Consent* (*Ceteris paribus*) the better. And this is the use of Councils; this is enough: But the Protestants that I have known and read, do make it our first Controversie with the Papists, Whether Christ ever Instituted any one Head or Ruling Power over all the Church, under himself? And, 2. Whether Pope or Council be such? Both which they deny.

XIX. If you have not read it, I intreat you read in the *Cabal-Supplement* King Henry the VIII's Letter to the Archbishop and Clergy of the Province of *Tork*, where you will find, & 1. Your cited seeming Contradictions of Scripture, answered by use of Speech and Reason, without any Universal Judicature. 2. That *Dic Ecclesia* cannot be meant of the Church Universal. 3. That the Universal Church hath no Head or Governor but Christ, but the Clergy subserve him, as Ministers by whom he giveth Spiritual Grace, and *qua Spiritu aguntur libera sunt, & nulla Lege astringuntur*; and if the Teachers do their Office with scandal, Magistrates must punish them, and that it is the *Ecclesia que non constat ex bonis & malis*, which the King is not the Head of: But that in *Spirituals*, as the word signifieth *Spiritual Persons* and their *Goods* and *Works*, and the enforcing the Observances of Gods Laws, the King is Head: And the reason of the word [*Head*] notably vindicated, with much more.

XX. I crave your Pardon both for the Prolixity and Boldness, while I add this Question. (not as accusing you of Popery, Perjury or Disloyalty)

How

How can I be cleared from the guilt of Perjury, and Disloyalty, if having taken the Oath of Supremacy, and subscribed according to the Canons, &c. I shall plead for the subjecting of the King and all Subjects to a *Foreign Power in Spirituals*? when the Oath disclaimeth it, and the *Can. 1.* saith, That *[all Usurped and Foreign Power hath no Establishment or Ground by the Law of God, and is for most just Causes taken away and abolished, and therefore no manner of Obedience or Subjection within His Majesties Realms and Dominions is due to ANY SUCH Foreign Power.]*

And all Ministers subscribe *Can. 36.* against all Foreign Power, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes, as Temporal.

And *Articl. 21.* General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes: (And when will all Princes, Orthodox, Heretical, Mahometan, Heathen, Enemies in War, &c. agree to gather them out of all the World?) And when they be gathered together, (for as much as they be an Assembly of Men whereof all be not Governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred even in things pertaining to God; wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation, have no Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of the Holy Scriptures. (And doth Church-Unity, Concord, and Salvation, lie on things not necessary to Salvation?) If you say, that none of this speaketh against Foreign Ecclesiastical Power, such as the Apostles had; I answer, 1. Not against a Foreigners Preaching and Baptizing, and Celebrating the Lord's Supper, if he be where we are, (and there be is no Foreigner :) But against all Foreigners

proper Government of Men as their Subjects. The Apostles Commission in that was extraordinary, and yet they Ruled Doctorally none but Voluntary Consenters. 2. The Law, Oath, Canon and Articles disclaim such Power as the Pope claimeth here: But the Pope claimeth proper Ecclesiastical Government, and most English and French Papists (and half the rest I think) claim for him only the power of the Word and Keys, and not any forcing Power by the Sword.

XXI. As hence, I wonder not that Mr. *Thorn-dike* threateneth *England*, unless we right the Papists by altering the Oath of Supremacy; so I conclude with another Request, That seeing Dr. *Heylin*, and many others of you, honour *Melanchthon*, you will read his Epistle to King *Henry the VIII.* *Epistolarum Vol. 1. per Pencer. Edit. Anno 1570. pag. 59. 60. &c.* But especially *Ep. de Ratiob. art. p. 188. &c. & de Wormat. Colloq. p. 201. &c.* where he speaketh against *Eccius* and other Papists overvaluing Councils, and making them Legislators and Judges to us, and tying the Church to the ordinary succession of Bishops, and Obedience to their Laws, and imagining the Church to be like Civil Polities, *Pag. 191.* [1. *Humano more Constituit in Ecclesia Potestatem interpretationis, pro-*

modum ut de prætoria potestate interpretandarum Legum Jurisconsulti Loquuntur. 2. *Addit amplius non licere privatis, non paucioribus reprehendere judicia Majoris partis seu dissentire à suffragiis plurimorum.* 3. *Majorum Synodorum sententiis & decretis parendum esse, &c.* — *In Ecclesia longe alia res est.* — *In hoc cætu non potestas alligata est certis personis aut certa multitudini, sed donum est aliquorum piorum: Id est, lumen divinum, quo intelligunt sapientiam in Evan-*

gelio

gelio traditam, qua est supra rationis humana judicium Posita. Pag. 195. addit Vinculum dilectionis a Paulo Vocari Obedientiam Praestandam Episcopis Ordinaria successione regnantibus & eorum legibus,— Yet Synods and Discipline he was for, by present faithful Pastors.

And Luther, *Lib. de Conciliis*, speaketh (as was his way) more sharply of Councils, telling us what their Work is, and is not; and that one *Augustine* hath taught the Church more than all the Councils that ever were, yea one Catechism: And that before the Council of *Nice*, Arianism was but a Jest in Comparison of what it grew to afterward, (though doubtless the Council did well in condemning it) and he justifieth *Nazianzen's* Words of Councils: And except the undeniable Evidence of *David Derodon*, he saith more than I have seen in any to vindicate *Nestorius*, as certainly holding one Person and sound Doctrine in sense, but for want of Learning, taking it for an improper Speech to say that God was begotten of *Mary*, killed, risen, &c. And that the Controversie of the *Ephes.* Council and him was but about Words. And I think he that readeth but *Derodon's* Citations of the Words of *Cyril*, will think me rather charitable than injurious, for saying that though his Words were Eutychian, he meant also better than he spake.

Ri. Baxter.

R Eader, The Bishop's repetition in Conference (before and with Dr. *Beveridge* and Dr. *Saywell*) occasioned my over-tedious Repetitions: But you may perceive they have not been wholly in vain, while at the last the Bishop was forced, I. To deny Canons to be Laws: And then what is their Churches Legislative Power? and how can we obey a Law that is no Law? And why are we called to Swear Canonical Obedience? or why are we called Schismaticks for not obeying them? And if they might be called Laws to their proper Subjects, can Usurping Foreigners therefore make us Laws?

II. He is put to disown the Names of *Universal Sovereignty*, and *Summa Potestas*, but only as *Invidious*, that is, as opening that which they would hide by other Names fitted to deceive: And yet maintaineth the thing, and calls them *Rectors* and *Universal Governors*: As if *Jurregendi* in Supream Rectors were not the same thing, and that which he knew we were to dispute.

III. When he hath oft pleaded for Obedience to the *Universal Church* and its Laws, and made Law-making its work, he is fain at last to reduce it almost to Sentence and Execution. And in his many instances of such *Judging Powers* to name not one that requireth an Universal Human Judge.

IV. He was angry at the Argument fetcht from the incapacity of an Universal King or Civil Senate; But why? Only, as invidious? that is, As detesting their Error; And saith, that it intimateth that they claim a Kingly forcing Power, whereas

whereas he knew that I profess the contrary of them, and only brought a comparing Argument. But if they had claimed no forcing Power, or made Princes believe that they were bound to be their Hangmen or Executioners, the World had suffered less, and they know that their Curses would have been despised as *bruta fulmina*, and Protestants would have said *Procul à Jove Procul à fulmine*.

V. He could never be got to give up the least shew of a Satisfactory account, where his *Collegium Pastorum* out of Councils was to be found, or whom it consisted of? They dare not go to Patriarchs whatever they think, as knowing how farr, and where they long have been, and most against them.

VI. Nor could he be got to answer my instances of the incapacity of Councils; nor my proof that they were not of *terrestrial*, but only of National (Imperial) Universality.

VII. Nor would he answer my proof of the utter incapacity, either of one Man, or one College; for Universal Government of all the World.

VIII. Nor to answer my proof that his Universal Sovereignty is the most essential Point of that which Protestants call Popery.

IX. Nor my Reasons that a Pope's Headship is not so impossible as this same, tho' both are impossible.

X. Nor the plain Evidence, that this way must needs bring us under the Government of the Pope himself, and every King and Kingdom under the Government of foreign Subjects, and of those Princes whose Subject-Bishops make the greatest Number in Councils.

XI. And we cannot be informed how their Form of Government differeth from the French, and that the French are no Papists. And that they that since *Land's* Time have studied a Coalition, would not receive them to our cost.

XII. Nor yet how the Nation and Clergy shall be saved from Perjury that are all Sworn against all Foreign Jurisdiction.

For it is a vain Argument that saith, The Oath of Supremacy renounceth no Jurisdiction but what the King owneth : But the King disowneth Ecclesiastical Spiritual Jurisdiction.

For, 1. Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Jurisdiction are expressly named. 2. The Oath renounceth it as *Foreign*, because it is against the King to be under the Power of Foreigners. The King chooseth his own Pastors, and Ruleth them by the Sword, (as he doth his Physitians) though he profess not to be a Pastor himself, nor to Administer the Word, Sacraments or Keys.

And the new Oath, called the Test, expressly abjureth the Foreign Jurisdiction of any Prince, Prelate, &c. Spiritual and Ecclesiastical.

It's ludicrous jesting with Oaths for any to say, by [*Prelate*] is not excluded [*Many Prelates in a College or Council, but some one*] : If *One*, much more many ; as *Prince* and *Potentate* excludeth many. And all our present Clergy that are in the Parliament and Convocation, have taken this Oath or Test: and they call themselves the Church-representative : And if after this they should be for a Foreign Jurisdiction (and specially Universal) in a College, or a Council, or a Pope, or a Council and College under the Pope as President, their Subscription to our Articles, and their usage

of Oaths, would be no invitation to Dissenters to imitate them, or Conform.

Chap. XIX. *Mr. Henry Dodwell's Leviathan further Anatomized.*

§. 1. **I** Have already elsewhere (in two Books) detected the Schismatical and Tyrannical Doctrine of Mr. *Dodwell* in his tedious voluminous Accusation of the Reformed Churches as damnable Schismatics, that Sin against the Holy Ghost, and have No right to Salvation by Christ. I recite now a few Passages that shew the Constitution of the Church he Pleads for.

Pag. 73. "The Essential work of the Ministry according to my Principles, is to transact between God and Man; to Seal Covenants on behalf of God, and to accept of those which are made by Men, and to oblige them to perform their part of the Covenant by otherwise authoritatively excluding them from God's part. (a) Hence results the whole Power of Ecclesiastical Government. And for this, No great Gifts and Abilities are Essential. All the Skill that is requisite essentially, is only in general to know the Benefits to be performed on God's part, and the Duties to be performed on Mans, and the Nature

(a) *Paul saith, I was not sent to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel of Christ, Mat. 28.*

And Paul to Timothy tell us of other parts as Essential:

They can include or exclude none but those that include and exclude themselves, which shall be effectual whatever the Priest say or do; He is but a Minister, Investor and Declarer of it.

“ture and Obligation of Covenants in general;
 “and the particular Solemnities of Ecclesiastical
 “Covenants; And of this how any Man can be
 “uncapable, who is but

(b) Then a Moscovian
 Priest may serve, or such
 as *Optandus* Bishop of *Geneva* was, illiterate: and
 one may be taken from
 “capable of understanding
 “the common Dealings of
 “the World—(b)

any Shop or Cart that understands the Dealings of the World.
 But how much more requireth *Paul* to *Timothy*, and *Chrysostom*, &c. 2. And yet I, and all of my Degree, yea, all the
 Ministers or the Reformed Churches that disown his *Leviathan*,
 are uncapable of Ministry or Christian Communion by our
 ignorance. 3. But is the Nature of the Covenant-Benefits,
 Duties, &c. so easily known as he talks? And yet must we
 Perish for not knowing them.

Pag. 72. “He sheweth that Immoralities of
 “Life are not sufficient to deprive them of this
 “High Power.

And of the Power it self he saith, *Pag. 80, 81.*
 “It is not stated in Scripture, but to be measured
 “by the Intention of the Ordainers, and that the
 “Hypothesis (of God’s setting in Scripture) is ir-
 “reconcilable with Government in this Life, by
 “permitting Men to appeal to Writings against all

(c) Note here, that tho’
 his Priesthood have the
 Power of saving or dam-
 ning Men; yet he confesseth
 the very office in Specie is
 not of God’s making. For
 if it be not stated in Scrip-
 ture, it is not in the meer
 Law of Nature; And our
 Church-Changes are no
 Prophets: And if God made
 not the office, then the arro-
 gated Power is not his Gift.

“the visible Authority of
 “this Life. (c) On the
 contrary (saith he) “Our
 “Hypothesis obliging in-
 “feriour Governours to
 “prove their Title to their
 “office, and the extent
 “of it from the intention
 “of their Superiour Go-
 “vernours, doth oblige all
 “to a strict dependance
 “on

“on the *Supreme* visible Power, so as to leave no
 “place for Appeals concerning the Practice of
 “such Government (which as it lasts only for this
 “life, so it ought not to admit of Disputes more
 “lasting than its Practice) from them, and that
 “upon rational and consciencious Principles: for
 “how fallible soever they may be conceived to be
 “in expounding Scripture, yet none can deny
 “them to be the most certain as well as the most
 “competent Judges of their own Intentions: As
 “certainly therefore as
 “God made his Church
 “(d) a visible Society, and
 “constituted a visible Go-
 “vernment in it, (e) so
 “certain their Hypothesis
 “is false.

(d) Note that he speaketh of God's Church in the singular Number, and not of national Churches which are many.

(e) He hath constituted a Species of visible Governors over the several Parts, but no one (Personal or Collective) over the whole.

P. 83. “How can Sub-
 “jects preserve (their due
 “Subordination to their
 “Superiours) if they practice differently? They
 “may possibly do it notwithstanding Practices of
 “Humane Infirmitie, and disavowed by them-
 “selves; But how can they do it while they de-
 “fend their Practices, and pretend Divine Autho-
 “rity for it? Yea, and pretend to Authority and
 “Offices unaccountable to them; which must ju-
 “stifie a whole course of different Practices.

P. 84. “If their Authority be immediately re-
 “ceived from God, and the Rule of their Practices
 “be taken from the Scriptures, as understood by
 “themselves what reason
 “can there be of subje-
 “ction to any humane Su-
 “periours. (f)

(f) Is it no Obedience unless it be absolute? Is none due to God above Man? Must not his Law be understood? Chap.

I Must intreat the Reader that he will not call any of these men Papists till they are willing to be so called : You are not their Godfathers: Do not then make Names for them. But I must confess that once I thought the stablished French Religion had been Popery, and I see no reason to recant it ; But if *Brierwood's* Epistles mis-describe them not , Mr. *Dodwell* is not so much of their Mind, for the Supremacy of a General Council, as I thought he had been : Will you know my Evidence ? It shall be only in his own words.

I. *Separation of Churches, &c. Pag. 102.* [“The Church with whom this Covenant is made, is a Body Politick as formerly , though not a Civil one] and “God hath designed all Persons to enter into this Society.

Pag. 98. “Faith and Repentance themselves, on which they so much insist, are not available to Salvation, at least not pleadable in a Legal way, without our being of the Church: And the Church of which we are obliged to be, is an external Body Politick: (So that it's clear it is the Universal Church, and a visible Humane Politie which he meaneth.)

Pag. 107. [“The design of God in erecting the Church a Body Politick, thus to oblige men to enter into it, and to submit to its Rules of Discipline however the secular State should stand affected— It is more easie for the vulgar Capacity whatsoever, to prove their interest in a visible Church, than in

"in an invisible one, consisting only of elect Per-
sons.

In these, and many places of both his Books, he tells us, that the Catholick Church is One Body Politick, and hath on Earth a *Supreme humane Government*, which I have noted in his words in my Answer to him.

II. Pag 488. "*Only the Supreme Power is that which can never be presumed to have been confined.* (Of which more in his words which I have confuted.)

III. That the Intention of the Ordainers is the true measure of the Power of the Ordained, he copiously urgeth (and proveth as much as the Ringing a Bell will prove it, by loudness and length.) Pag. 542. [*Therefore the Power actually received by them, must not be measured by the true sense of the Scripture, but that wherein the Ordainers understood them.*] Now the Ordainers of the first Protestants never intended them Power to abrogate the Mass, or Latin Service, or Image-worship, or to renounce the Pope, or gave them any Power but what was in Subordination to the Pope, but bound them to him and his Canons, and to the Mass, and the other parts of Popery. To prove this, he saith, [Pag. 489. "*It is very notorious that at least a little before the Reformation, Aerius and the Waldenses and Marsilius of Padua and Wickliff were Condemned for Hereticks, for asserting the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters: And it is as notorious that every Bishop was then obliged to Condemn all Heresies, that is, all those Doctrines which were then censured for Heretical by that Church, by which they were Ordained to be Bishops—Our Protestants themselves do not pretend to any Succession*" in

" in these Western Parts, where themselves received
 " their Orders, but what was conveyed to them even
 " by such Bishops as these were.

And Pag. 484, 485, 486. he sheweth at large,
 "[That All the Authority which can be pretended in
 " any Communion at the present, must be derived from
 " the Episcopal; especially of that Age wherein the se-
 " veral Parties began.—Within less than Two Hun-
 " dred Years since, there was no Church in the World
 " wherein a Visible Succession was maintained from the
 " Apostles, which was not Episcopally Governed. And
 " the first Inventers of the several Sects were at first

" Members of these Episco-
 " pal Churches*, and re-
 " ceived both their Baptism

" in them, and all the Orders they received.—There
 " was then no other Communion that could give this
 " Authority.—Our Adversaries will not deny,—
 " but that their Orders were received by them, were
 " actually received by their Forefathers in the Epis-
 " copal Communion*.—They

* And the Papal. " have actually received no
 " more Power from God, than

" they have received from their Ordainers;—For
 " their Ordainers, are they, and they alone, who have re-
 " presented Gods Person in
 " dealing with them*.—

* Representing his Per- " 2. They have actually re-
 son is a high word. But he " ceived from their Superi-
 never enabled them to " ors nothing but what their
 change his Laws, or Church- " Superiors did actually in-
 Offices; but only as Ser-
 vants, to deliver that same
 Power by way of Investiture, which he had instituted and described in his Law, and was
 in their Commission: As the Londoners may not change the
 Lord Mayor's Office, but put him in that which the Charter
 maketh.

"tend to give them. One
 "would think this should be
 "very clear (a).

(a) Yes: If the Bishops had been Makers of the Office, and Donors with absolute Power, and not only Servants entrusted to deliver their Masters Gifts and Offices.

To the Objection, that [*They ought to have given more Power,*] he answers, "*That only proveth that we have no more, if they wronged us.*" Where now is all the Reformers Power? Did the Pope or his Bishops intend them any against himself?

IV. But yet he perceived that some might say, *Particular Ordainers might have singular Intentions.* (And I cannot tell him that as *Richardus Armachanus*, and abundance more thought Bishops and Presbyters to be *eiusdem Ordinis*, so did *Jacobus Armachanus* of late, and Bishop *Downname* and many other Bishops, and declared that Presbyters had Power of Ordination, but for Order sake it should not be without the Bishop, save in cases of necessity.) To this he saith, [*"That the Ordainers must be presumed to do according to the common sense of the Church and Canons.*] But what if they declare the contrary? As Bishop *Edm. Reynolds* openly declared that he Ordained Presbyters into the same Order with Bishops, who were but the prime Presbyters; and that he was of Dr. *Stillingsfleet's* Judgment, that no Form of Government was *Jure Divino necessario*.

Saith he, [*Pag. 487. "The Law is alway charitable to presume that every Man intends as becomes him to intend: (Very good.) But it's prudent to presume his actual Intention not from what others do think will become him, no nor from what will really become him in the Judgment of God.— Therefore*
"they

"they must not judge of the Intention of the Bishop by

* I am wholly of your Mind, specially as to the Pope and his Bishops: But I'll judge of their Power by the Will of God. "the real Will of God*.

Supposing us to be [*Proud of the Suffrages of the Schoolmen*, pag. 492. 493. He suspecteth, "It was "rather Picque than Conscience that brought them to "it. (Alas! Were not the Schoolmen Prelatical enough? Many of them were Bishops, and one was a Pope at least.)

And the Council at *Basil* that allowed Presbyters deciding Votes, and *St. Jerome*, and the Reformers, all fall under his Censure for the like; viz. That Necessity put them on it as a Shift, or else the Pope by the Vote of Bishops would have carried it; and he justifieth not the Necessities choice, but concludeth, *Pag. 496, 497.* "If it be "suspicious whether the Men who then followed these "Principles did embrace them out of a sincere sense of "their Truth, then they cannot be presumed to have "been Principles of Conscience. Which if they were "not, this is sufficient to shew that they are not fit "Measures of the Power that was actually given by "the Bishops of that Age.] I confess, I had thought that the Papist Bishops Intention had not been the Measure of the Power of Bishops or Presbyters: And that *Mr. Dodwell* had not been so much against the Council of *Basil* as unjust Conspirators by ill means to overtop the Pope.

He saith truly, *Pag. 505.* ["Most certainly they "who were of this Opinion, (the Papists) could not "intend to follow the Doctrine of the Wickliffites and "Waldenses, who had been lately censured for maintaining the Equality of Bishops and Presbyters.] No
nor

nor the Doctrine of *Luther*, *Cranmer*, or such as the Church of *England* hath held.

V. Yet being forced to confute himself, he saith, p. 52. [“ It is sufficient for my purpose that Ecclesiastical power be no otherwise from God, than that is of every Supreme Civil Magistrate. It is not usual for Kings to be invested in their Offices by other Kings, but by their Subjects. Yet when they are invested, that doth not in the least prejudice the Absoluteness of their Monarchy, where the fundamental Constitutions of the respective places allow to them.”] (And hath not God’s fundamental Law as much Power?) much less doth it give any Power over them to the persons by whom they are invested.

“ If the Power of Episcopacy be Divine, and all that men can do in the case be only to determine the Person, not to confine his Power, &c. (what kept the man from seeing how great a part of his Book he here confuteth?) Doth he not confess now that God’s Law may give the Power, which men may not alter, but only determine of the Person to receive it? In the case of the Presbyters Office he will have it otherwise, because the Bishops are, forsooth, not only the Investors, but the Donors, who give just what they please; and he proveth it fully, by saying it confidently and copiously: Because God giveth it not immediately: Yes, he immediately by his Spirit in the Apostles, instituted the species, though he do not immediately chuse the Receiver. But who giveth the Bishops their Power? The Council is above them: Do they give them their Power? Who giveth them theirs? And who giveth the Pope his Power? If his may be given by Divine Charter without a Humane Donor, but a meer Investor, why may not a Presbyter?”

T

VI. But

VI. But it is the *Vicendeity* that is his great foundation. Pag. 543. saith he, [*"Nor is there any reason for them to oppose God and the Church as they do*

* The Church is the Bishops and Council, the Pope being President.

*"on this and other occasions * If the Churches Authority be received from God, then what is done by*

"Her, is to be presumed to come from him, the same way as what is done by any man's Proxy is presumed to be his own act: And as what is done by an Inferior Magistrate by virtue of his Office, is presumed to come from the Supreme.]

This is in Answer to an Objection, That [the Powers united by God are inseparable by any Humane Authority: But the Power of Ordination is by God united to the other Rights of Scripture Presbyters, &c.]

He answers [If our Adversaries mean, that those Presbyters who had both those Powers united in them by God, could not be deprived of the one without the other, nor of any by any Humane Authority; this, if it should prove true is a case wherein our present Ordinations are not concerned, which were not received in those times, wherein our Adversaries pretend to prove that

* That is, in Scripture times. Dr. Hammond confesseth the same: And yet we are all no Ministers, and have no Sacraments, nor right to Salvation, if we have not uninterrupted successive Episcopal Ordination from those times.

these two Powers were inseparably united *. They may be separated de facto, tho' they who separate them be to blame for so doing.—If they were then united by God, because they were united by the men who represented God,

why are they not disunited by God now when men alike impowered by him have disunited them? Why should they not oblige God in one case as well as the other?

Readers, you see here the Core of the Churches disease, and chief of our differences: 1. By the Church they mean not the People, but the Prelates and Councils headed by their great President. 2. They suppose these to be *God's Proxies*, and that God doth what they do, and they so oblige God to stand to it, and men to take it as God's act. 3. They suppose these *Prelates and their President alike impowered by God, as the Apostles were*; and therefore God by *his Proxies* now may undo what he did by his Proxies then. Do you now wonder if Pope and Council by Canons have power from God to make new Canonical Scriptures, and new Universal Laws for the Church; yea and for the World? And if these may undo the Scripture Laws and Institutions, and make other Sacraments and Worship in their stead?

But Protestants have long ago proved, 1. That there is no Vice-God, and that God hath no *Proxies* or proper *Representatives* with whom he hath entrusted his Power so, as that their word must lead, and he will follow: But only Embassadors, whose Message is prescribed them by God, and they are to speak and do only what he bids them, and he will own it, and not that which they add of their own, or which they do against his Word.

2. That the present Pastors have not the same power as the Apostles had; who were commissioned to deliver Christ's Commands to the World, and enabled for it by the Spirit of Infallibility and Miracles: Even as the Jewish Priests had not the Power of *Moses*, nor could change a tittle of the Law, but only keep it, teach it, and apply it.

VII. That he and his followers are for a Supreme.

preme Governing Visible Humane Power over the Universal Church, is a thing that I need not cite their words further to prove. Mr. *Thornike*, Bishop *Bromhall*, Bishop *Gunning*, Bishop *Sparrow*, Dr. *Saywell*, and the rest of that mind, are not ashamed of it. And it is a *General Council* that by some of them is supposed to be this Supreme Power: And when I have proved against *Johnson* that there never was a General Council of the Christian World, but of the Empire, I can get none of them to answer me (save that when the Empire was broken, some of the pieces came together for a Job at *Florence*, &c.) But it is the Pope's right, saith Bishop *Bromhall*, to be President and Patriarch of the West; (which *Thorndike* and others largelier insist on as the necessary *Principium Unitatis*, which turned poor *Grotius* to them for Unity. But I confess I thought Mr. *Dodwell* had been more for a Councils Power than I find he is.

The Protestants believe no Supreme Governor of the whole Church but Christ. Dr. *Iz. Barrow* of the Unity of the Church, hath fully overthrown the fiction of a human Supreme Aristocracy as well as of a Monarchy: But an Union of all the parts in one Head Christ, we all believe, and consequently a Communion among themselves.

VIII. But what Mr. *Dodwell's* Judgment is of the Power of the Council, and whether the Supremacy be in it, or in the President, I will tell you only in his own words; supposing the Reader to know that the Papists so far differ among themselves, that 1. Some are for the Pope's Supremacy alone, the Council being but his Counsellors, as some are for the Kings, the Parliament being but his

his Counsellors. 2. Some are for the Councils Superiority over the Pope, as some say Parliaments are greater than the King, and urge his old Oath to pass such Laws *quas Vulgus elegerit*; so say they, the Pope must own those that the Council passeth; yea, that they may depose him if he deserve it. 3. Some say that Universal Legislation belongs only to the Pope and Council agreeing, the Pope being to Call and Approve them: And this is the prevailing Opinion among them; so that the Controverlie is much like that which men have raised about Kings and Parliaments. Now, saith Mr. Dodwell,

[Ch. 24. Pag. 509, &c. *Even by the Principles of Aristocratical Government, no Power can be given validly, but to persons who are at least in conjunction with those from whom they receive their Power—Subordinate Authority must be derived from the Supreme. No act can be presumed to be the act of the whole Body, but what has passed them in their Publick Assemblies, (in which Body is the Right of Government)—so it have the prevailing Vote: Nay, though that prevailing Vote be not the greater part of the Society, so it be the greater part present at such Assemblies**, God himself cannot be supposed to have made a Government, even of his own Institution, practicable, till he have settled these Rules of Administring it†. As nothing but the Society it self can in justice make a valid Conveyance of its Right, so it is not conceivable how the Society it self can do it by any thing but its own act.

*What an happy advantage hath the Pope, that can get forty Italians together at Trent, seven years before he can send to, and they come from Mexico, Abassia, Armenia, and all the World. There is an Art in all things, and men live by their wits.

† Sir, God will not learn of you: But God hath made no such Government at all, Monarchy or Aristocracy.

If

If this be so, 1. Mark that this man disclaimeth any other Divine Institution than by the Society. 2. The People that have no Power, being the greater part of the Society or Church, give the Bishop and Pope, and Council their Power. 3. If the Clergy were all the Church, the Presbyters give that Power to the Bishops and Pope, which they had not themselves. 4. All runs on the false Antimonarchical and Anarchical Principle, which I have confuted in *Hooker*, that the Body makes Power by giving up their own Right. 5. Then the General Councils and Pope have no Power: For the Body of the Universal Church never gave it them, but the Emperors, (save as to Teaching and Arbitrations.) 6. Then in those Countries where the Body of Clergy and People put down Bishops, there Bishops are put down by such as had Power to do it. For 1. If man may set up Diocesans, Popes and Councils, man may take them down.

Yet the *Proteus* changeth his face, and presently supposeth [that the whole Right of these Assemblies could not have proceeded from the bare consent of the Society, but from the actual Establishment of God.—No Assemblies can dispose of the Rights of such Societies, but such as are lawful ones according to the Constitutions of that Society.—As out of Assemblies they have no power to act who might act in them, how many soever of the Suffrages, and how freely sever they had been gotten; so all those Meetings, how numerous soever, for acts of Government, if they be not Legal, they add nothing of advantage to the power of particulars singly considered. They are not in the Eye of the Law, Assemblies, but Routs, and their concurrence, not Consent, but Confederacy: And as it were

were Rebellion in particular persons to attempt any thing of that nature concerning the Government without the consent of their present Established Governours;—so is there nothing in such a Meeting that can give them any Power as united more than they had as singly considered, that may excuse them from Rebellion *.

Nay rather, by the Principles of all Societies, that which had not been Rebellion, if done singly, is counted so, if it be done in unlawful Assemblies. And sure none can think it reasonable to ratifie the acts of Rebels. — And if the Society be not represented by unlawful Assemblies, how can it in justice be obliged by them? How can any of its Rights be disposed of by them who are not its Legal Representatives *.

—P. 513. The most natural way is by abrogating the acts of such Assemblies. Therefore the Jurisdiction of the Assembly by the Presi-

dent, is a right consequent of the Office of a President, as a President, and a circumstance requisite to make the Assembly it self lawful—specially where no certain places or periods of times are agreed on for the keeping of any *. There must be some who have the power of Assembling them, when they judge it convenient for the publick, and who may be allowed for competent Judges of that convenience.—Every one is not permitted to judge of the occasion.—But there is none concerning whom this Power can so probably be presumed—None to whom all undisposed

* A General Council meeting without the Call of the Pope their Established Governour, are Rebels.

* 1. Hath the King no power but as a Representative? If yea, why not others? 2. Who made Pope or Prelates the Representatives of those that never consented to them?

* Now we know what Councils have Authority: Only those appointed by the President.

Power, does by the common Rules of all Societies, so naturally Escheat, as the President of the Assemblies. Even in the Assemblies a Veneration is due to him, for his Office above all other Members, but much more so out of the Assemblies, where none is in a likely way to be able to oppose him. He who calls an Assembly must have some advantage over all the Members called by him, that he may oblige them to convene, and it is necessary to the Publick that they be obliged to meet when they are so called, that is, when the JUDGE of Circumstances thinks it necessary, &c. But there is none who can pretend to this advantage, I do not say, of Jurisdiction, but even of Authority and Reverence, above his fellow Members, besides the President.

Besides, the Power of such Assemblies expires with the Assemblies themselves: so that in the intervals of Assemblies there remains no more of that Power, &c. But the Convening of Assemblies is an act of Authority, in that very interval, and therefore cannot agree to any but the President, whose Authority alone can be antecedent to the meeting of the Assemblies; so that if it be the right of any it must be his, because none besides him is capable of it.

Ans. 1. Did Hosius of Corduba, or Eustathius Antiochenus, or Cyril Alexandr. Anatolius Const. &c. call the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, &c. or had an Antecedent right to it? 2. Hath no King or Parliament a right to call a Convocation in England? 3. Have not K. James, Jewel, Crakenthorpe, Buckeridge, Bilson, Carlton, Abbot, Field, Andrews, and other English Bishops and Divines, and Chamier, Sadeel, Chemnissus, and the rest abroad, fully proved that the Emperors called the General Councils, as did the Spanish and French Kings, and the Emperor Provincial ones. 4. Doth not every

every Conformist Subscribe to the Articles of Religion, which say, that General Councils may not be called but by the Will of Princes? Though Mr. Dodwell have the plain Honesty not to be Ordained or Subscribe these English Articles, Mr. Thorndike, Bishop Bromhall, Bishop Gunning, Dr. Saywell, Dr. Parker, &c. I suppose did; But let us hear him further.

"And this is more certainly true of him who has
 "a right to preside in *Assemblies* when they are con-
 "vened by *Virtue* of his General Right to preside over
 "the whole Society, as well when *Assemblies* are not
 "Convened as when they are, than of him who is
 "chosen by the particular *Assemblies* for their parti-
 "cular Occasions. And he who has his Precedency
 "not by virtue of any particular Election, but for
 "term of Life, must have such a Presidency as I am
 "speaking of. Not only the *Assemblies* convened by
 "him are in this regard lawful; but also no *Assem-*
 "*blies* are lawful but what are called by him, be-
 "cause there is no other way of making them law-
 "ful, but the lawfulness of their Call; nor any
 "Power to Call them distinct from that of such a
 "President.

Do you wonder that this Man Conformeth not? Or do you not wonder that those Subscribe and are called Protestants that are of his Mind? If they can answer the Articles, the King and Parliament, that say the King hath Power to call Synods, what do they make of their Readers that obtrude such Baronian fictions on us, without once attempting to answer Protestants, who with all credible Historians, prove it past all modest Contradiction that Emperors were the ordinary Callers of the General Councils, and not the Pre-
 sidents or Pope.

Pag. 516, 517. He goeth on asserting Assemblies called without the President to be unlawful, nullities, and by the highest common interest to be punished (so far must we think the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, &c. to be from binding us) and saith, [*“ Indeed the Bishops could not renounce this Power without dissolving the Society by making the Exercise of Government unpracticable, or without changing the whole frame of Government; For— who must have it? If none had had it, how could the Society be secured, that Assemblies should meet if none had Power to oblige particular Members to be present at them when called? If at any time no meeting were ascertained, the Government would be dissolved? ”*]

Ans. 1. Did this reading Man never hear of the Claim of Princes to call Councils in their Dominions? Did he not know where he lived? Did he never read the late Act of Parliament in Scotland, that asserts all Church-Power in Exteriors to be in the King? Nor any of the Protestants Confessions or Divines? Should I think he had quite forgotten all this? or that he had the craft to take no notice of it, as that which was too hot to handle?

2. And was it not a piece of Wit to take it for granted that such Assemblies (as he calleth the Councils) are so Essential to the Church, that the Government and Society is dissolved without them, or without a Ruling Presidents Power to call them? And the Pope must have a Power to oblige all particulars to come when he calleth them? And no wonder when (unless Men be Cheaters) the whole Power Escheateth into the Presidents hands when the Council is dissolved, which is when

when ever his Holiness please : And long enough may you Petition him for these Church Parliaments, when to call them, is to surrender part of his Power.

Ans. 3. But what if all these Church Councils as such have no Governing Power at all over any of the particular Bishops, any more than a Synod of Schoolmasters have over each others Persons and Schools, but meet only by Christ's general Obligation to do all their work with greatest Prudence for Mutual Help and Concord? He hath been told on both Ears oft enough that this is not only his Adversaries Judgment, but such great Bishops as I have oft named : yea, and of Grotius his Friend, when he wrote *de Imp. sum. Potest.* And where do you find this Disputant once attempt in all this begging presuming Volume to prove any Regent Power in such Councils (but what the Magistrate giveth them.)

Monstra mihi, inquit Hieron. quisnam Imperatorum celebrari id Concilium jusserit? saith Grotius, (ib. P. 168.) Non ideo convocari Synodum quod in ea pars sit Imperii, satis jam demonstratum arbitror : Finis ergo, ut Episcopus Wintoniensis recte notat, hic est, ut ad veritatis & Pietatis amplificationem Consilium Principi prebeant ; hoc est, Præant ipsi judicio directivo— & ut per Synodum stabiliri testataq; fieri possit Consensio Ecclesie.— Omnium autem horum finium nullus est necessarius simpliciter. Neq; Synodus simpliciter ad illos fines necessaria. This he goeth on to prove, and more than so, that Synods are oft hurtful (as well as unnecessary, Cum potius, saith August. rarissima inveniantur hereses propter quas damnandas necessitas talis exstiterit.) I will not repeat, saith Grotius, the Complaint of almost all Ages, that the chief

chief Diseases were brought into the Church à Sacerdotibus : citing Nazianzen, he addeth, *Negit de Arianis duntaxat Synodis, sed de omnibus suorum temporum, præcipue quibus ipse interfuit* (Mr. Morrice might easily know this) — Nec pauca referri possunt si opus sit infelicioꝝ concilioꝝ exempla, quale fuit sub Constantino Antiochenum, Casariense & Tyrium, cujus conventum Episcopis scribens Constantinus, nihil ait ab illis fieri, nisi quod ad odia & dissensiones ferendas, ad perniciem deniq; humani generis faciat. — Zanchy's way cited by him, is oft better than Councils, that the Magistrate command Ministers in Controversies, 1. *Uti non suis sed Scripturæ vocibus*, 2. *Et à publicâ damnatione abstinere.*

And Pag. 209. saith Grotius, *The Church hath no Legislative Power by Divine Right* — What was written in Synods before Christian Emperors for Order and Ornament, are not called Laws but Canons, and have either only the force of advice, as in things which rather belong to singular persons than to all; or they oblige by way of Agreement, &c. But some Legislative Power may be given by humane Laws. —

But perhaps some will say that Mr. Dodwell speaketh only of National, or Provincial, or Diocesane Councils, and not of General ones, and therefore by the fixed President, meaneth not the Pope.

AnsꝞ. 1. I would he were willing and able to tell what he meaneth. But he felt what a fine advantage he had under the Name of Bishops Presidency to please a Party, and say more than every one of them shall at first perceive. But he expressly maintaineth that the Universal Church is one Political Society, and hath a visible Supreme hu-
mane

same Government that is Absolute, and from which there is no appeal : And that this Society hath Legislative Power, and is bound but by the Laws made in its own Assemblies : And that these Assemblies are Rebels, and punishable if not called by the President : And though Mr. D. had the Prudence to use the word President rather than Pope, if ever he speak intelligibly it's here. And Mr. Thorndike (whom he valueth as a sound Protestant) Archbishop Bromhall, and the rest of the Tribe, do openly assert the due Presidence of the Pope, as *Principium Unitatis* and first Patriarch.

Saith Mr. Dodwell further, Pag. 522, 523. [Supposing those Presbyters that chose the President had invested him in his Office by Prayer and Imposition of hands, and no Bishops had any more to do in his Consecration, than Kings have in the Inauguration of our ordinary Kings—it will not follow that those Presbyters who chose and consecrated him, must have any more Power over him—Nor is it only true that this way may be so—but indeed it must be so ; whenever the Person so invested is supposed to be invested in the Supreme Power, and whenever the Society over which he is placed is also Independent on other Societies [As the Universal Church is] Such a Person can never be placed in his Power, if not by them who must after be his Subjects, unless by his Predecessor, which no Society can safely depend on for a constant rule of Succession. (And doth any but the Pope pretend to this Sovereign place)? In his own Society he can have none of his own Order that can perform the Ceremony to him, because we suppose Him to be Supreme ; and there cannot be two such in one Society. (True : And you make it your fundamental that the Catholick Church is one such Society ; and so must have such a Supreme). And

And it's worth the noting which he adds [“ And
 “ therefore I, for my part, am so little solicitous for
 “ any consequence that may be hence inferred to the
 “ prejudice of my Cause, as that I am apt to think
 “ that this must have been the way at first in the
 “ making of Bishops, how Absolute soever I conceive
 “ them to have been when they were once made.—

Ans. Are we not beholden to the Universal
 Presidentship for this concession? I forced John-
 son, alias Terret to the same: And yet both these
 men cry down a Power resulting from God's Law
 or Charter to the person duly receptive, when
 yet the Instance of the Papacy constraineth them
 to make it their foundation. Why then must
 Presbyterian Ordination be Nullity, if Inferiors
 only chuse and Consecrate the Pope, and Presby-
 ters only at first chose and Consecrated Bishops?

Obj. The difference is, that such Inferiors are but
 Electors and Investing Ministers, and not Donors of
 the Power, but Popes and Prelates are Donors.

Ans. 1. Then no Prelate could be such but by
 the Popes or Councils donation. 2. Doth not
 Mr. D. oft say, that the Body is the seat of Power,
 and so giveth it? 3. But why should he think
 that we must take his word for this difference and
 the Prelatical Donation instead of Ministry? Do
 not the Papists themselves more commonly hold
 that the Presbyters (or Priests) Office is of fixed
 Divine Institution, and more unalterable, than
 that the Bishops is? The latter is disputed; the
 former undisputable. (It may be Mr. D. will
 thus prove that he is no Papist: But I had rather
 he be one than worse.)

Nay, what will you say if after all he be half
 an Independent?

P. 523. saith he, [“ *This seems best to agree with the Absoluteness of Particular Churches, before they had by compact united themselves under Metropolitans and Exarchs into Provincial and Diocesan Churches.—And this seems to have been fitted for the frequent Persecutions of those earlier Ages, when every Church was able to secure its own Succession by its own power without depending on the certain opportunities of the meeting of the Bishops of the whole Province. And the alteration of this practice, the giving the Bishops of the Province an interest in the Choice of every particular Colleague, seems not to have been so much for want of power in the particular Churches to do it, as for the security of Com-pacts, that they might be certain of such a Colleague as would observe them.—And he thinks [it probable that it was in imitation of the Philosophers Successions, that these Ecclesiastical Successions were framed.—And when the Philosophers failed to nominate their own Successors, then the Election was in the Schools.]*

Ans. What could be said more gently by such a man? 1. Then the first Churches were like Philosophers Schools; very good; not many score or hundred Schools as the first and least Order. 2. The Government of Churches was much like that of Philosophers in their Schools. 3. Bishops (and much more Presbyters) might be made then without Bishops, by the Election and Consecration of Presbyters. 4. This was the old way in time of Persecution. 5. This alteration was not for want of Power in the Particular Churches, &c. 6. But it was made to secure Observance in the Colleagues. 7. And Church Successions framed in imitation of Philosophers.

We

We shall in due time enquire whether we are all bound to stand to these changes. on pain of all the scorn and sufferings that the followers of them will lay upon us.

Will you know more of this Self-confutation? In his Preface he saith, [P. 4. "*I suppose all Churches Originally equal, and that they have since submitted to prudential Compacts.*"]

But are not all we (poor nothings then) obliged on pain of damnation to stand to all that our Fore-fathers did? And must we not take the Imperial Subjects of *Asia, Africa* and *Europe*, (we know not who) for our Fore-fathers in *Brittain*? and be of that Heathens mind that drew back from Baptism, when he heard his Fore-fathers were in Hell, and said, that he would be where they were? No, this moderate man tells you, ["*Though they may oblige them as long as the reason of these Compacts lasts, and as far as the equity of those Compacts may hold, as to the true design of those that made them, and as far as those Compacts have meddled with the alienable Rights of Particular Churches; yet where any of these Conditions fail, there the Particular Churches are at liberty to resume their Antient Rights.*"]

Obj. Yea, but who shall judge when any of these Conditions fail?

He answers next [*And I suppose the power of judging when these Conditions fail to be an unalienable Right of Particular Churches, and not only to judge with the Judgment of private discretion, but such a Judgment as may be an authentick measure of her own practice.*]

We thank you Sir, that you give us so fair quarter: But if you had not, had we known where,

where, we should have commenced a Suit for our Native and Christian Birth-right, and put you to prove *quo jure* John, Thomas, Peter, &c. meeting a thousand years ago we know not why, nor when, nor by what Authority, did give away the Birth-right and the Souls of an hundred millions not then in being, that never consented or heard of their names, nor were bound to know that there was such a City as Rome, Nice, &c. or such men as Leo, Tharassius, &c. in the World. And if you had answered us according to the Roman genius with Gaols, or Fire and Faggot, we would have appealed to God whether you and all such will or not; and when God judgeth, do your worst.

But would you think what a stress this Humane Catholick layeth on innovating Prelates Compacts? He adds after all this,

P. 6. *Whoever they were that nominated the persons, whether the People, the Clergy, or the Prince, or the Pope; yet still they were the Bishops that performed the Office of Consecration; which was that which was then thought immediately to confer the Power.*

Ans. You were not then in being, and therefore did not then think it. — And you know mens thoughts so long before you were born no better than others; *Oportet fuisse memorem*. Had you not memory enough to make your Preface meet with your Book, where you say that Presbyters did Consecrate Bishops, and yet did not give them the Power? and say that as to the Supreme President, (we know his name) it must still be otherwise.

Yet this fundamental Humanist concludeth,
p. 11. [*They must be guilty of disobedience to the Divine Government, — Guilty of giving or abetting a Divine Authority in Men to whom God has never gi-*

ven such Authority, nay in opposition to all the Authority, he has really established among men. They must be guilty of forging Covenants in Gods Name, and counterfeiting the great Seals of Heaven in ratification of them. And what can be more Treasonable by all the Principles of Government? What is more provoking and more difficulty pardonable — They must be guilty of sinning against the Holy Ghost, and unto Death, and of the sins described in the passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with which none do terrifie the Consciences of ignorant unskilful persons more than they do. They must be guilty of such sins which as they need pardon more than others; so do they in the nature of the things themselves more effectually cut off the offender from all hopes of pardon in an ordinary way. By being disunited from the Church, he loses his Union with Christ, and all the Mystical benefits consequent to that Union. He has therefore no Title to the Sufferings, or Merits, or Intercession of Christ, or any of those other blessings which were purchased by those Merits, or which may be expected from those Intercessions. He has no Title to pardon of sin, to the gifts and assistants of the blessed Spirit, or to any Promises of future Rewards, though he should perform **ALL OTHER PARTS OF HIS DUTY**, besides this of uniting himself again to Christ's Mystical Body in a **VISIBLE COMMUNION**: Till then, there are no promises of acceptance of any Prayers which either he may offer for himself, or others may offer for him. And how disconsolate must the condition of such a person be!

And pag. 20. Suppose I were mistaken — why should they take it ill to be warned of a danger? —

Ans. 10. What harm was it for those, **Act. 15.** to say, Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses,

Moses, ye cannot be saved? And yet did Paul rail when he said, Beware of evil-workers, beware of Dogs, beware of the Concision? What Sect cannot easily without a Doctors degree thus dispute? You are all damned that be not of our mind or Sect. But the Devil hurts those most whom he least affrighteth.

Ans. 2. What if we put this to wise men to tell us, 1. How he can prove that all the Christian World agreed to the Compacts that bring us under these hellish consequences. I provoke him again to answer my proof against Terret, that they were the Compacts but of one Empire?

2. How proveth he that we Britains are under such Compacts, when our Ancestors (and the Scots) renounced Communion with the Romanists?

3. If our Ancestors after turned to Popery or Church-Tyranny, how proveth he that we are any more bound to sin as they did, than if they had turned to Arianism or Turcism? when Ezek. 18. & 33. speak for the clean contrary.

4. What if we prove that Christ hath himself given the Church in the Scriptures, an account of his own Institution of Church-Form and Government, as much as is necessary to its Essence, Unity and Salvation, and that all altering Compacts contrary to this are diabolical: Will Christ damn us for not breaking his Laws, and serving the Devil? Is it the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable, not to despise Christ's Laws, and not to obey the Devil?

5. What if we prove to him that the very Species of his Prelacy, and specially of a Supreme Catholick Jurisdiction is condemned by Christ, and Treason against him? Are we Traytors for not being Traytors?

U 2

6. What

6. What if we prove to him, that according to his very Canons, the Pope and Bishops that he damns us for not owning, are no Bishops, having no true Call and Title to that which they pretend to ?

Will you have yet another of his Self-contradictions ? P. 7. *[I cannot but look on it as an Argument that God never intended to oblige Particular Churches to as great a dependence on other Churches as that is wherein he has obliged Subjects to depend on their own Churches, because by his contrivance of things it does not follow, that Separating Churches must be left as destitute of the ordinary means of Salvation on their separation from other Churches, as particular Subjects are on their separation from their own Churches— Abating what obligations they have brought on themselves by their own Compacts, God has made them equal.—There is no way of judging who is in the right, but by the intrinsic merit of the Cause. I really believe that the true original design of those Compacts whereby particular Churches have voluntarily submitted to restrictions of their original Power, was ONLY that every particular Church might have her Censures confirmed in all other Churches in reference to those who were originally her own Subjects ; not to gain a Power over any other Subjects but her own ; nor to submit to any other Power, &c. Alas ! And have Compacts by we know not who brought us all into the snare of the unpardonable sin ? Though Christ died for the World, he saveth none but Consenters : And can Men in Asia, in Towns whose Names we poor Countreymen never heard of, make Laws to Damn all to the Worlds end, that obey them not ; and this without our own Consent ?*

To conclude, this Gentleman hath yet an easie remedy against all this : He doth indeed frequently prove (if you will believe him) that though you have *Faith that works by Love, and do all other duty*, (that is in Love to God and Man) you cannot be saved without external Communion, that is, subjection to this humanly compacted Catholick Church ; so said Pope *Nicholas* long ago, yea and *Aeneas Sylvius* when *Pius* 2d, that all other Graces and Duties will not save a Man that is not subject to the Bishop of *Rome* : But saith this Man, p. 13. *They may easily avoid the danger only by returning to the Catholick Unity.* Mark *Catholick Unity*. National Unity will not serve : We grant it. But what *Catholick Unity* is, and whether Catholick Councils with a Catholick President that hath an Antecedent Power to call and oblige them, without which they are null, rebellious and punishable, and to whom all Power escheateth in the Intervals of Councils, whether I say, this be necessary to Catholick Unity, or to Antichristian Church Tyranny is the doubt.

I will conclude this with *Dr. Iz. Barrow's The- ses*, p. 255.

1. *Patriarchs are an Humane Institution.*
2. *As they were erected by the Power and Prudence of Men, so they may be dissolved by the same.*
3. *They were erected by the leave and confirmation of Princes, and by the same they may be dejected, if great reason do appear.*
4. *The Patriarchate of the Pope beyond his own Province or Diocess doth not subsist upon any Canon of a general Synod.*
5. *He can therefore claim no such Power otherwise than upon his Invasion or Assumption.*

6. The Primate's and Metropolitans of the Western Church cannot be supposed otherwise than by force or on off fear to have submitted to such an Authority as he doth Usurp.

7. It is not really a Patriarchal Power, (like that granted by the Canons and Princes) but another sort of Power which the Pope doth Exercise.

8. The most rightful Patriarch holding false Doctrine, or imposing unjust Laws, or Tyrannically abusing his Power may and ought to be rejected from Communion.

9. Such a Patriarch is to be judged by A free Synod if it may be had.

10. If such a Synod cannot be had by consent of Princes, each Church may free it self from the mischiefs induced by his perverse Doctrine and Practice.

11. No Ecclesiastical Power can interpose in the management of any Affairs within the Territory of any Prince without his Concession.

12. By the Laws of God, and according to ancient Practice, Princes may model the Bounds of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, erect Bishopricks, enlarge, diminish or transfer them as they please.

13. Wherefore each Prince having Supream Power in his own Dominion and equal to the Emperors in his, may exclude any Foreign Prelate from Jurisdiction in his Territories.

14. It is expedient for the publick peace and good that he should do thus.

15. Such Prelate according to the Rules of Christianity, ought to be content with his doing so.

16. Any Prelate Exercising Power in the Dominion of any Prince, is eatenus his Subject; as the Popes and all Bishops were to the Roman Emperor.

17. Those

17. Those Joins of Ecclesiastical Discipline Established in the Roman Empire by the Confirmation of Emperors, were (as to necessary continuance) dissolved by the dissolution of the Roman Empire.

18. The Power of the Pope in the Territories of any Prince did subsist by his Authority and Favour.

19. By the same Power as Princes have curbed the Exorbitancy of Papal Power in some Cases, (of entertaining Legates, making Appeals, disposing of Benefices, &c.) by the same they might exclude it.

20. The practice of Christianity doth not depend on the subsistence of such a form instituted by man.

As to Mr. Dodwell's fundamental Opinion (that the Minister can have no Power which the Ordainer intended not to give him) He overthroweth by it all the Reformation and all the English reforming Ministry, as derived from the Roman Ordination: For it's certain that the Roman Bishops intended not to give them Power to reform, or to Worship God as they have done.

And the Protestants are against him: Saith Dr. Challoner (in his *Credo Eccles. Cath.* p. 95.) However the Priest at the Baptizing, or the Bishop at the Ordination, had another meaning, yet the words wherewith they Baptized and Ordained being the words of Christ, are to be taken in Christ's meaning; in as much as he which receiveth from another, is to receive it according to the intension of the Principal Giver, and not the Instrumental Giver. He which confers Baptism and Orders as the Principal Donor is Christ; the Bishop or Pastor confers them only as his Instruments.] So others.

As all Power is of God and must be obeyed, so Usurpation is of Satan, and the higher the worse; and the word *Antichrist* is supposed by

many to signifie one that is a *Usurping Christ*, that is, a *Usurper of Universal Sovereignty* which none but Christ is capable of.

Mr. *Jos. Glanvilles* Character of Devils or Evil Spirits in his *Sadduceismus Triumphatus* is considerable, p. 33. and 42. Edit. 2. ["The meanest and
" *basest in the Kingdom of darkness — having none*
" *to Rule and Tyrannize over within the Circle of*
" *their own Nature and Government, they affect a*
" *proud Empire over us, the desire of Dominion and*
" *Authority being largely spread through the whole*
" *circumference of degenerated Nature, especially a-*
" *mong those whose Pride was their Original Trans-*
" *gression : Every one of these desireth to get him Vas-*
" *sals to pay him Homage. —*

" *The good Angels have no such ends to prosecute,*
" *as the gaining any Vassals to serve them, they being*
" *Ministring Spirits for our good, and no self-designers*
" *for a proud and insolent Dominion over us.*

But I think no Devil but *Beelzebub* the Prince aspireth so high as to be Ruler of all the World or Church: And when Cardinal *Bertrand* told *Philip King of France* that God had not been Wise if he had not set up one as his Vicegerent visibly to Rule all the World, I do not find that he set up that Vice-god so far above God himself as to forbid obeying him before his Viceroy, or to deny Gods Universal Laws to be above Mans, and to deny all Appeals to God and his Word, or to say that the President of Counsels must be obeyed without excepting,

If Gods Laws and his be inconsistent.

Since the Writing of all foregoing, Mr. *Dodwell* hath Published the Second Part of his *Leviathan*,
called,

called, A Discourse of one Altar and one Priesthood, as against us whom he calleth Schismaticks, and me in particular. It is much of the Complexion of the First Part, (His Schismatical Book) being a Chain of many linked Propositions, of which many are false, and many falsely shaped and applied: But put off with a confident Affirmation that he hath proved them true; And his former Method is defended by as confident an Affirmation, that all that is said against them invalidates not his proof. The shortest way, I confess, of defending himself, and answering others, and saveth the labour of much Writing and Reading: And I think if the tedious Discourses of his two Volumes had been just so abbreviated, it had been a Kindness to his Readers.

§ 2. Whether he reserve his Answer to my last Book against him to another Treatise, or mean to overpass it by saying it is contemptible, I know not, nor much desire to know. I find him here in his Preface doing that which may serve his turn much better than an answer, *viz.* 1. Many angry Charges that I slander him; 2. An attempt to prove it agreeable to his Method. 3. Confident Affirmation that I write not accurately, nor answer his Proofs. And to those that read his Books and not mine, this is enough.

§ 3. His Proof of my Slander is mostly by way of question; *Where did I say this or that?* Where, 1. Those things that I spake of others, he feigneth me to say of him: Joyning divers late Writers together, I mention what is said among them, some one part, and some another, and he takes all to himself. 2. When I mention the clear Consequences of his Doctrine. 3. And when in my Letters

Letters I recite his *Verbal Discourse with me*, he asks, *Where have I said it.*

Did I not find him a *designed Hider*, I would not suspect *designed Fraud*, but should be very glad that he so much as intimateth in his Questions a denial of so many Errors; But who can choose but suspect his Sincerity in such *seeming Denials*, who findeth some of them unsincere. *E. g.* He asketh (*Pref.*) *Where did I once call Thomas Aquinas a Saint?* This startleth me: Many times have my Ears heard him call him [Saint Thomas] and never once heard him call him otherwise. And doth he now seem to deny it? I never said that he so wrote, but so called him. Had I not reason to believe that when he oft calls (*the Church of Christ* in the singular Number; *One Political Body under One humane Government which all must obey, and not question, whether it's Laws be agreeable to the Law of God*) that he meant the *Church Catholick*, and not a *Diocess*? There are Thousands of *Diocesses*; but the Church that he spake of is *but One*. Had I any reason to believe that when he talkt of the *sole right of the President to call Councils or Assemblies to make Church Canons*, that he meant only *Diocesans*? When as a *Diocessane* hath no Bishops under him to Convocate? And whether it be not Convocate Bishops to whom he appropriateth this Legislation, let the Reader judge as he seeth cause.

§ 4. But I abhor making any Man thought to own what he disowneth. And I gladly receive his intimated Denyals in these Questions; and tender them to the Consideration of all that are for a foreign Jurisdiction.

1. Mr. *Dodwell* denieth (by intimation) *all humane Universal Church Supremacy*, and consequently *all humane Power of Legislation or Judgment over the whole Church*. He denieth the Government of the *Catholick Church Collectively* ought to be either Monarchical or Aristocratical, in Pope or Council.

2. He denieth the Pope to have any *Primacy* or *Presidentship* in General Councils, or that it belongs to him to call them. It was but a *Diocesans Power* to Convocate his Presbyters that he meant.

3. He taketh the French Church for Papists, while they own the Popish Communion (though many are not so in their Principles: But it is Mens Principles that I spake of, and not their Communion).

4. He denieth Communion with any part of the Roman Church (Doth Dr. *Saywell* do so?)

5. He taketh the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* for Papists, (and hath no Communion with those that own them as being Papists.)

6. He proveth the French Church guilty of the *Hildebrandine Doctrine* of deposing Princes (and *Aquinas* too.)

7. He disowneth the terms of *Cassander* and *Grotius* as not sufficient to a lasting Peace.

8. He (odly) dreamed that when I deny a Governing College of Bishops, I thought the Lord Bishop of *Ely* had meant such as our University Colleges, cohabiting, (this is no Slander in him) yet he declareth that by such a College, he means but Bishops *eiusdem Speciei*, governing the Church by parts, and not any *One Numerical Sovereign Company*: But that they should hold all due Communion

munion (which he may see I still grant.) And he falsly fancies that I am against *Cyprian's* naming of Colleagues or his sence.

§ 5. But if Mr. *Dodwell* be sincere, he makes himself one of the greatest Separatists in the World: Consider how narrow his Communion is, and the Church which he owneth:

1. He hath no Communion with the rigid Italian Papists.

2. Nor with the moderate Papists that are for the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*. For he takes them for Papists with whom he hath no Communion.

3. Nor with the Church of *France*, because they have Communion with Papists: Though many of them are no Papists in their Principles.

4. He hath no Communion with any Protestant Churches that have not Bishops.

5. Nor with any Protestants that have Bishops not Ordained by Canonical uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles (at least presumptively).

6. With none of the Greek Church that have Communion with the Church of *Rome*, or with any Schismatics, or that want such Succession, or refuse the Laws of the Church (which is all.)

7. With none of the remote Nations, called Jacobites, Nestorians, &c. Because they are judged Hereticks or Schismatics, or Communicate with such, or have a notorious interruption of Succession.

8. Not with the Maronites, or any Sect that Communicate with Papists.

9. Not with the Nonconformists of the Church of *England*, whom he endeavoureth to prove Damnable Schismatics.

10. Not

10. Not with the true and old Church of *England*, who professed to hold Communion with those Foreign Protestants whom he calleth Schismatics: Nor with any of the present Bishops and Conformists, who profess the same Communion: For his Rule is, that they are Schismatics who Communicate with Schismatics.

Who then hath he Communion with? It seems none but those few new Men in *England* of his own Mind, who perhaps may call themselves the Church of *England*.

11. Nay, not with those among them who profess Communion with the Church of *Rome*, except with the Jesuited part.

12. And with those of them who are for one Supreme Universal Aristocracy, or Legislative College, Council and Judicature over the Universal Church.

And now can you tell which is the Church that he is of: Or is there a more notorious Separatist or Schismatick than he?

§ 6. And now can any Man tell which is that Church which he speaketh such wonderful things of? as the *One Body* Politick of Christ) with one visible human Government? Which be the Bishops and Church that have all that Leviathan-like Power of Heaven and Hell, which he describeth and asserteth? Is it only the uncertain reliëts of all these?

§ 7. Mr. D. hopeth (justly) that none, or few of his friendly Readers will read what I write against him; and therefore when I detect his Fraud and putid Errors, he puts it off with saying, [I do but put many new Questions, and answer nothing accurately.] But, for the sake of them
that

that will read, I will ask him, 1. Whether his little invifible Church be a Body meet for the Glorious Elogies which he giveth the Church of Chrift; I profefs I know not one Bifhop that is of his profefled Principles. Archbishop *Laud* was not, that took a General Council to be a Court of Pretorian Power to be externally obeyed by all the Church. Bifhop *Guning* is not, as the fore-faid Evidence fheweth.

2. And I would ask him whether his Church have all the Power of Heaven and Hell which he describeth, over thofe that are without the Church, or only over thofe within? *Paul* faith, What have we to do to judge them that are without? And if fo, how narrow is the Power of his magnified little Church? Let their own Subjects efcape their Damning Power how they can; it feems none of all the people on Earth whom he counteth Schifmatics or Hereticks are within their reach: For thefe with him are all without. If it be faid, They were within when they were Baptized, I answer, 1. What they *were*, and what they *are*, is not all one. 2. But he faith that the Sacraments are but Sacrilegious Acts and Nullities that are done by fuch. And if fo, they were never Baptized, and fo never in the Church.

§ 8. But let us come to his new Book and Method. And firft I will tell him once more what our different Church Principles are, that he may not accufe he knows not what.

1. Chrift is the only Head, Prophet, Prieft and King to the whole Church on Earth; both of Influence and Government, Conftitutive, Specifying

ing and Unifying ; and hath no Deputy or Vicar under him, Aristocratical or Monarchical that hath any such Capacity, Power or Obligation.

2. Therefore the Church though Compaginated in all its parts, is only one Politick Body of Christ, and not of Man, and hath no other Sovereign.

3. Therefore neither Pope, Council or College of Bishops have any Legislative or Judicial Power over the whole Church Collective ; but only the several Pastors are such to their several Churches.

4. Yet are they obliged to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace and Love, and to do all in Concordant Observation of Christs Laws. And all Churches and Christians to help others to their Power.

5. And when they afford such Counsel, or help for Concord to other Churches, they do it not as Lay-men, but as Pastors, in the Universal Church, though not as Pastors to other Mens Flocks. As Physicians of several Hospitals, and Judges of several Courts, or Mayors of several Corporations, or Kings of several Kingdoms may advise for Concord, without Usurping each others Government.

6. As God only by *Moses* made the Jewish Law, and the Priests were not to make more, but only to Rule by it, it being a Prophetical and Mediatorial Work : So Christ only by himself and his Spirit (of Infallibility and Miracles) in the Apostles, made the Christian Universal Law, and no Men are to make more such, but to Rule by that so made.

7. As *Gerson* truly told the Pope, Christs own
Law

Law is sufficient for the Government of the Church (Universal) else Christ had not been a perfect Law-giver: And they that pretend by Supplements or Emendations to add or do better, are not his Ministers but Accusers.

8. Therefore those Popes and Councils that have presumed to make Laws for the whole Church have Usurped Christs Prerogative, and are false Prophets or Traytors against Christ.

9. Therefore none should own them as such, nor is it Schism, but Duty so far to disown them.

10. Nor should any own these Bishops as such, who own this their Usurpation. As no Soldiers of the Kings Army should follow those Captains who subject themselves to and take Commissions from an Enemy, Usurper or Foreign Princes.

11. The Power of Bishops under Christ as to Laws is only to keep and teach Christs Laws, and Rule by them, and determine themselves of undetermined circumstances or accidents, which vary as time and emergent occasions vary, and are unfit for Universal Obligation; and this Power they have only over their single Flocks, though by contract they may join in such things with others for Concords sake.

12. When the case of many Churches is alike, and their common good requireth Concord in any such accidents, all are bound to observe such Concordant Agreements, by virtue of Christs command for Concord.

13. But if on this pretence Pastors will turn Agreements for Concord into *Laws*, and make that seem needful to Unity which is against it, and hurtful to the Churches, no Christians should encourage their Usurpation by Obedience, it being

being contrary to Christs general Laws.

14. Whatever maketh true Christians maketh Men Members of Christ and his Church? And only the Essentials of Christians go to make true Christians, and the Integrals to make compleat Christians.

15. The Canons of Bishops are not Essential to Christianity, nor the understanding the many Controversies about Diocesans, Patriarchs, Councils, Ordinations, Successions, nor to know which is the true Bishop.

16. Baptism is our Christening, and he that is truly Baptized is a Christian, and a Member of Christ, and hath the pardon of Sin and right to Heaven before he be a Member of a particular Church, or Pastor; as the Eunuch *Acts* 8. and many converted without Bishops: As the Indians by *Edeus* and *Fruementius*, and the Iberians by a Maid, &c.

17. Whosoever truly repenteth and believeth and loveth God as God, and is of a Heavenly Mind and Life, is pardoned before God, before Baptism, and Baptism doth but Invest him in it, and make him a Christian more fully by Covenant and before the Church, and the want of it without contempt will not keep him from Salvation.

18. No one shall be saved by being joyned to a right Bishop, or receiving the Eucharist, who hath not true Repentance, Faith, Love, and the Spirit of Holiness: No Sacrament saveth the unqualified.

19. Thousands live in ignorance and wickedness, in Atheism, Sadduceism, Carnality, Adultery, Drunkenness, &c. that conform to Bishops

and receive the Eucharist. And to tell such they are in a state of Salvation is opposition to Christ, and Damnable deceit of Souls.

20. The Levites and Inferior Priests received not their Office from the High-priest, but by Gods Law had it by Inheritance to which God chose the Tribe of *Levi*: Nor had the High Priests power to add to, or alter the Laws and Office of the Inferior Priests or their own.

21. Nor was there a necessity of an uninterrupted regular Succession; much was of man's making: Christ owned them that were in possession, though Usurpers, not of *Aarons* Line, but such as bought the place of the *Romans*.

22. Seeing the High Priest was a Type of Christ, and the Scripture saith so much of the change of the Law and Priesthood, and Christ hath made sufficient Laws for Church Offices, it is presumption to Judaize, and pretend to any other imitation of the High Priests than Christ hath ordained.

23. No one of the Apostles was an High Priest over the rest, but had equal Apostolical Power.

24. Christ rebuked them for seeking who should be greatest, and expressly forbad that which they sought.

25. Every Pastor or Church-Presbyter hath an Office subordinate to the Teaching, Priestly and Ruling Office of Christ.

26. Every ones Pastoral Office is instituted and described by Christ (by his Spirit in the Apostles) and this specification is Divine, which none may alter, nor make any other such.

27. Therefore (as Papists confess of the Pope) all that men have to do is (not to be makers or donors

donors of the Office, but) to determine of the persons that shall receive it from Christ's donative Instrument, his Law, and ministerially to invest them (as men Christen, Marry, Crown Kings, &c.)

28. No Minister or Priest representeth Christ *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, as Embassadors or Justices do the King.

29. Christ's Laws are above mans, and no man's to be obeyed against them. To obey man against God is Idolatry.

30. The Priests or Bishops are under Christ's Laws as well as others, and by them all their true Power is given and limited: And therefore if they go against Christ's Laws, they represent him not therein, nor are to be obeyed, as usurping an unjust Power.

31. Therefore every Christian hath a Judgment of discerning whether Bishops Laws agree with Christ's, and must be governed as reasonable creatures, and not as Infants, Idiots or Brutes.

32. They that deny this, and require absolute obedience in all things, set man above God, and make it the duty of Subjects to be Atheists, Infidels, Idolaters, Mahometans, Murderers, Adulterers, Hereticks, where Kings, or Popes, or Prelates will command it.

33. Multitudes of Church-Canons have been contrary to Christ's Laws, as I have (with grief) proved in my History of Councils.

34. Bishops that deposed Emperors and Kings were not to be obeyed therein.

35. Almost all the Christian World since the use of General Councils are disagreed who are the true Bishops, one Party setting up one, whom

others reject and condemn ; so that if it were necessary to Salvation to know who is the true Bishop of the several Churches, few Christians could be saved.

36. Many Canons nullifie the Office and Power of these Bishops who come in by the Magistrate, without the choice or consent of the Clergy and People : And I think Mr. *Dodwell* professeth Communion with few but such, and so is by Canons condemned.

37. There is no Law of Christ, or unchangeable Law of man for appropriating a certain space of ground to one Bishops Jurisdiction. *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* thought that at first most great Cities had two Bishops and Churches, one of Jews, and one of Gentiles. And the Apostles never so appropriated any places to themselves, but oft divers in one City were their Teachers.

38. Occupation of a space of ground for Priestly Power is no just Title, and may be altered : And if it were, the Primitive Occupation was contrary to Mr. *Dodwells* Model.

39. If each City was to have a Bishop, each of our Corporations should have one, being all Cities in that antient sense.

40. It is not necessary to all to be of any fixed particular Church, as I have proved elsewhere (of Travellers, some Embassadors, Merchants, Vagrants, &c.) while they are of the Universal Church, and own Christ, and obey his Law.

41. The Electors do more to the making of Bishops than the Ordainers : Oft-times Bishops have ordained contrary Competitors, some one, and some another ; and are oft forc't to ordain whom Princes and Patrons chuse.

42. *Cyprian* and his *Carthage* Council, prove in the Case of *Martial* and *Basilides*, that it is the Peoples Duty to forsake those Bishops who are not qualified according to Christ's Law, though Canonically ordained and approved. And *Martin* separated from such; and *Gildas* saith he is not *eximius Christianus*, that owned the Brittish Bishops.

43. Christ hath left sufficient Directions, for the continuation or restoration of the Priestly Office, without Canonical successive Ordination uninterrupted; As well as God hath done for Kings.

44. Seeing Mr. *D.* saith, *A Presumptive title* may serve, he thereby confesseth that it is not real Canonical Succession; but the Opinion of it that he makes necessary.

45. The Question is, Who must be the Presenters? When they so greatly differ? *Grotius* presumed that the Chief Minister of a City or a Church was really a Bishop, though not so called.

46. The Reformed can prove a more probable Succession than the Roman, whose frequent interruptions hath been oft proved.

47. If we must imitate the Jewish High Priesthood, not every City must have one, but every Nation (and so *England* hath none) or else all the World.

48. *Judea* being a small Country, all the People at their great Anniversaries might go up to *Jerusalem*; which in great Kingdoms and Empires is impossible.

49. It is false that we are united to Christ only by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. Baptism which is no Sacrifice, first uniteth us to him publicly, as Faith and the Spirit do before secretly.

50. It is a frivolous thing of Mr. D. to write a Book for one chief Altar and Bishop, when the Question is of what Church that one must be: I have proved that *Ignatius* appropriated them to Churches no bigger than our Parishes, and Mr. *Clerkson* hath proved more; and the Man confuteth none of this proof.

51. Seeing he disowneth one Universal High Priest, and would have one in every City, or Nation at most, who knoweth not that the City Bishops of the World are now (and have been 1200 Years) in so great dissention disowning each others Communion, that it's hard to know Catholicism by his way of Communion.

52. And who shall Govern these several Bishops, if each one be a Supreme? Have they not as much need of Government as Presbyters?

53. The Eucharist is no otherwise a Sacrifice, than as it is an instituted Symbolical Commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice.

54. The validity of the Sacrament depends not on the uninterrupted Succession of the Priest, nor his Subjection to the Bishop.

55. There are many Cases in which it is a Duty to be ordained, and officiate without the Bishops consent: As in all the Popish Countries where they will admit none without consent to Sin.

56. To make Bishops and all their Curates the absolute disposers of Heaven and Hell, is to set up the highest Papal Tyranny over Kings and Kingdoms, by vile Presumption.

57. His words that the People can better judge of their visible Union with the High Priest and Christ, than of any invisible one, is a pernicious intimation, that this visible Church Union will
save

save them that have not the invifible Grace of found Faith, Repentance, and the Spirit of Love and Holinefs.

I intended to have proceeded to a diftinct Answer to Mr. *Dodwell's* whole Book, becaufe I take him to be the moft injurious and grofs Adverfary to the true Unity of the Church, on pretence of Pleading for Unity, of any that calls himfelf a Proteftant; and find him not only extreamly felf-conceited, loquacious and magifterial (in a lowly Garb) but grofsly unfincere, intimating his denial of that in Print, which he often owned to me in Private Conference, *viz.* for the Nullity of the Proteftant Churches, that have not his falfe Character, for the verity of the French Church, and for the uninterrupted Succeffion of the Papal Seat; when I undertook to prove it, he told me, It was not for the intereft of Chriftianity to fay fo; And yet it is for the intereft of Chriftianity for him to Unchurch more Churches, I think than the Papifts ordinarily do.

But when I had gone thus far, I was flopt by the Perfecutions of his Church-Rulers, and then by Sicknefs, and after by near two Years Imprifonment for my Paraphrafe on the New Teftament by a Judicature, as admirably agreeing to his Principles, as if he had been his Difciple (Chancellor *Jeffreys* lately Dead.) and fuch others.

Therefore not to tire the Reader with more words to fo wordy a Man, I again and again (though I fuppoſe in vain) provoke him and his dividing Brethren, to answer my Treatiſe of Epifcopacy, my firſt Plea for Peace, my Sacrilegious defection of the Miniſtry rebuked, my Apology

for the Nonconformists Preaching, my English Nonconformity, and Mr. *David Clerkson's* Posthumous Book for the Primitive Episcopacy, against his Fiction of the present Diocesane Episcopacy, as having no Bishops under them. But fraudulent Disputers will dissemble, and silently pass by that which they cannot answer: But will that be Peace to Conscience in the End?

Having said as much as I think needful to satisfy intelligent impartial Readers, against his Schismatical Writings, in my Book of Church-Concord; and here before, I take my self discharged from any Obligation, further to detect or confute his Fallacies. The rather because he can say and unsay, as he finds his Interest lead him: And his *Leviathan Church-Viceregent*, which he feigns to be God's Proxy to us, from whom there is no appeal to Scripture or to God, will to Men that believe in Christ, I think by his own Description, appear as frightful as *Hob's* his *Leviathan*.

(Some of this I wrote long after the most of the Book.)

Chap. XX. *Dr. Thomas Pierce now Dean of Salisbury's Judgment (and Dr. Hamonds.)*

§. 1. **I** Think *Dean Pierce* is the only Man surviving, who was Commissioned by King *Ch. 2.* to Treat with us for Concord, as being of the Bishops part, in 1661: And who hath lived to see by near 30 years Experience whether his Zeal against the terms of Concord which we as humble Supplicants offered, hath done more Good,
and

and prevented more Evil, than a Concord on those offered terms would have done. What it hath done on him I know not, but with others Experience hath had as little Success as Reason and Petitioning had.

§. 2. He hath written against me more Book's than one, which no Man hath excelled in insulting and in command of words: His work is to prove *Grotius* to have been no Papist. Few Men living think higher of *Grotius* than I as to what he wrote before his change: Especially his Book *De Satisfactione Christi*, and that *De Imperio Sum. Pot. & de Jure Belli*, and his Annot. on the Evangelists. *Valesius* and *Petavius* took him to be of their Religion and Church, as did *Vincentius*, and *Saravius*. But 1. It is not the Name [*Papist*] that I regard, but the Thing. 2. Therefore the doubt between Dr. *Pierce* and me is, *What is Popery?* He thinks that it is not a proof that he is a Papist to be for an Universal Church Jurisdiction, the Church of *Rome* being taken for the Mistress of all Churches, and the Pope as Primate, and Patriarch of the West, governing according to the Canons of Councils, and not Arbitrarily; And taking the Articles of Pope *Pius*, his Creed and Oath added at *Trent*, which contain the Body of that which Protestants call Popery, to be such as may be Sworn and bear a fair sense. (Though Dr. *P.* himself cannot subscribe them.) This with all the rest cited by me out of *Grotius* he taketh to be no proof of a Papist. Let him call it how he please, The French Church Government, or the Protestant or the Catholick, it is the Thing (a Foreign Jurisdiction, and specially an Universal that I deny.)

§ 3. And

§ 3. And this he himself owneth, for the proof of which I refer the Reader to his Books; particularly his *New Discoverer*, Append. P. 206, 207, 208: where he is for one Government of the whole Church: Not *in specie* only, (for so we are as well as he, each Governing *per partes* in his own Province, as Kings in their several Kingdoms.) but numerically, by one Aristocracy, the Pope being *Principium Unitatis*; And Aristocracy is a Government formed and unified *in una Persona Politicâ* consisting *ex pluribus Personis naturalibus*; Else it would not make one Sovereignty, nor one Political Church or Society. Therefore his saying P. 206. that the Pope's Primacy as (Universal) and his Western Patriarchate, is no *Monarchy*, but exactly reconcileable with an *Aristocratick Government of the Church*] reconcileth not me at all to his Model, who am past doubt that, 1. One Aristocratical College is far more incapable of Universal Government of the Christian World, than a Pope. [If *inter impossibilia daretur Magis & Minus*] 2. And that a College of the Subjects of Foreign Kings (e. g. *France, Spain, Portugal, Armenians, Abassines, Turks, Moscovites, &c.*) are unsitter for Foreign Jurisdiction, and particularly to Govern *Britain* than a Pope is.

The Confutation of Dr. *Pierce* is sufficiently done before and after: I now only recite his Opinion; And am sorry that (*he is sure that Dr. Hammond was of the same Religion with Grotius*, and for such a Jurisdiction. But if any be for the French Church form of Government, call them Papists or Protestants, as they shall themselves desire; It is the Thing, and not the Name that I oppose. The French know by feeling what that is; God grant we feel it not.

Chap.

Chap. XXI. *That this New sort of Prelatists who were for a Coalition with the French or Roman Church, have been the great Agents of all the Dividing, Silencing, Persecuting Laws, which have brought and kept us these Twenty seven Tears in our dangerous lacera-
ted State.*

§ 1. **T**HAT the Church of England before the days of *Buckingham* and *Land* were quite of another Mind, I have before fully proved: And no reasonable Man can doubt of it, who hath read the Apology of the Church of England, and *Jewel's* Defence of it, and the Writings of *Whitaker*, *Fulk*, *Humphrey*, *Field*, *Willet*, *Airy*, *Bernard*, *Craken-
thorpe*, *Sutcliffe*, *G. Abbot*, *Rob. Abbot*, *J. Reynolds*, *Morton*, *Usher*, *Downname*, *John White*, *Birkbeck*, *Cook*, *Perkins*, *Bilson*, *Andrews*, *Hall*, *Davenant*, and many such Bishops, Dignitaries, and other Conformists; besides, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Hooker*, *Farrar*, *Bradford*, *Philpot*, and the rest of the Martyrs. Besides the Nonconformists. -

§ 2. And that the true Church of England even in *Land's* time and since, have never consented to this Coalition, is evident. 1. In that *Heylin* confesseth that *Land* prevailed but with four or five more Bishops to be so much as Arminians, viz. *Neale*, *Howson*, *Corbet*, *Buckeridge*, and *Mountague*: And he that readeth *Buckeridge* his Book for Kings, and *Mountague's* Works, will think that even they were against this Coalition.

2. And

2. And he confesseth that *Land* durst not put his Cause to a Convocation, because so small a Number there were for him.

3. And to this day the Church or Parliament have not revoked the Homilies, Articles, Liturgy, Apology, or any of the Writings of the Bishops and Doctors aforesaid, who have written against Popery.

4. And excellent Writings have all along to this day been Published by the Church Doctors against all such Confederacies with Papists; such as Dr. *Stillingfleet*, (who though to please his Superiors he defended *Land*, yet defended not all that he said or did) Dr. *More*, Dr. *Tillotson*, Dr. *Tennison*, Bishop *Th. Barlow*, Mr. *Wake*, yea, even *Henry Fowles*, and many more; But above all, Dr. *Isaac Barrow* of the Supremacy, unanswerably, though *S. Parker* had Confidence enough to pretend a Confutation.

§ 3. The Endeavours for a Coalition that were publickly attempted in *Scotland*, *Ireland* and *England*, by *Land* and his Agents, have been so voluminously written of, Accused and Condemned in Parliaments, and his own Death, and the long Wars and all the Fractures that have followed, were so much of the Consequents, that to say more of this is Vain. Dr. *Pet. Heylin's* Life of *Land* doth acknowledge and justifie all. And *Prin's* History of *Land's* Tryal largely openeth it.

§ 4. When the Parliaments and Scots Opposition, and the ensuing Civil War had broken this Design, and the Bloody Massacre in *Ireland* had rendred Popery more odious and dreadful than all Arguments could do (before our War here) the Parliament that had before the War, begun to
Purge

Purge the Church Ministry, of Drunkards, Scandalous, and ignorant incompetent Men, proceeded too far on Civil Accounts, and ejected some for adhering to the King, and being against them in the War (though some of us dissuaded them from all such severity.) *Cromwell* first rebelled against the Parliament, and usurped the Government, and shortly died, and his distracted incoherent Army striving against the Democratical Relicts of the Parliament, dissolved their usurped Government, which Dissolution brought in King *Charles II.* (by *Monk* and the Presbyterians, as the Dissolution of the Parliament had brought in *Cromwell*. And with the King return many of the ejected exasperated Clergy, full of the Desires of Revenge, and of preventing all Danger to their Dignities and Promotions for the time to come; But at first they were diffident of their present Strength, and thought they must execute their Revenge and Mutation by degrees: The Lords, Knights and Gentlemen that had suffered for Fighting against the Parliament for the King, Published many Protestations to draw in the Presbyterians to restore the King, that they would be for Love and Concord, and seek no revenge: *Dr. Morley* was sent before the King to Cajole the Ministers to believe that the King was a Protestant, and inclined to Moderation; And thereupon a moderate Party of Episcopal Men, met with some called Presbyterians, and declared their desires of Concord on sober terms, (*viz.* *Dr. Bernard*, *Dr. Gulston*, *Dr. Allen*, and others such). But *Dr. Morley* used them to his Ends, and shifted off all discovery of his Designs, still quieting them by general pretences of Moderation, and Treaties.

ties. He had the Chief Power over Chancellor *Hyde*, who ruled the Land; And *Sheldon* was next him, and *Hinchman* the third: But under them truckled many of the same Mind.

The King published a Declaration of Liberty for tender Consciences (at *Breda*), (expounded since by 27 Years barbarous Persecution, laying all on the Protestant Prelatists that would not make a Law for it.)

I was past doubt in 1660. that the King was as he Died, or had engaged himself to promote it here, first by giving them Liberty of their Religion, and afterwards the Power of the Land, in Magistracy, Militia, and the Church. Knowing Men said that *Morley*, *Sheldon*, *Gunning*, and the other Chief Agitators, knew this, and thought they had no other way to oblige him to keep up the English Prelacy, but to engage, that they would be firmer to his Absolute Power, and sole Legislation, and for Passive Obedience, and for the Extirpation of Puritans and Parliament Power, than the Jesuites were; and therefore that he should be more for them than for the Jesuites. And withal that they would begin where *Land* was interrupted, and would attempt a Coalition; or if that failed, would yield to Liberty for the Popish Religion, (which joined with their power would soon prevail.)

§ 5. At that time Mr. *Calamy* and I motioned a Treaty with the Prelatists for Union and Concord, with which the Earl of *Manchester* and the Lord *Overy* acquainted the King: which he presently accepted as an Opportunity to quiet Men till his Absoluteness was settled. He promised us that the Church Bishops should meet us in the mid-way,

mid-way, if we would come as far as we could without Sin.

The Drs. that were for the nearer approach to *Rome*, and the defenders of *Grotius* his design, were the chief Agents Commissioned by the King to Treat with us, viz. Dr. *Sheldon*, Dr. *Guning*, Dr. *Peter Cousins*, Dr. *Sparrow*, Dr. *Heylin*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Dr. *Tho. Pierce*, Dr. *Hinchman*, Dr. *Lanny*, Dr. *Stern*, and such other; but by their Power with the Lord Chancellor *Hyde*, Dr. *Morley*, Dr. *Sheldon*, and Dr. *Guning* over-ruled all the Work. When we told them how great a number of the most Godly and Loyal people of the Land would be undone for nothing by the Impositions which they seemed to resolve for, and how unavoidable a Division it would cause throughout the Nation, and what Encouragement Profaneness and Popery would thence take, and what mischievous Effects among the Clergy and People would unavoidably follow, and how easily all this might be by them prevented, and the Love and Honour of their Persons and Order hereby won, Dr. *Guning* and others told us plainly that they had a greater party than we are to consider, that must not be alienated to please us: And when Dr. *Bates* said that abundance more of the Popish Ceremonies might be introduced by the same Reasons as were pleaded for those imposed, Dr. *Guning* answered, They must have more and not fewer. And Dr. *Morley* told me, That he had good reason to believe that most of the Roman Church on this side the *Alpes* (that is, *France*) would have joined with us, were it not for the stumbling Blocks that *Calvin* had laid in the way. They charged us with Sedition for telling

ing them how many would dissent and suffer, and what a weakening such a Division, and the Penalties that must enforce it, would be to the Protestant Interest and to the Land: And they all agreed (save *Dr. Gauden*) that they would not abate one Ceremony to prevent all this: Yea lest they should not cast out enough of the Ministers, they put in more and harder Impositions, and made the Terms of Concord and Ministry such as they knew would turn out more; *Sheldon* and others of them saying, They were afraid too many would Conform, and if this much would not turn them out, there should be more; for Enemies in the Church were more dangerous than without.

§ 6. It is likely that the Drs. and Bishops that had been with him beyond Sea, knew the King's Religion and Designs, and to keep up their worldly Greatness, Dominion and Wealth, resolved to please him that he might please them: What Religion King *Charles* the Second was of at his Death, his Brother hath told us: And what he was before his Return, I marvel not that *Huddleston* tells us so obscurely: But I had rather believe his own words and deeds, than the reports or conjectures of others.

It was the Opinion of the wisest Papists that Liberty for all Religions, with the Power of Dissolving of all Offices of Government and Preferments, would be enough to bring in Popery, and that there was no other way: And that till the King could safely declare himself for Popery, his way was to do all as a Protestant that might advantage them: Especially to divide and break the Protestants, and root out those of them, who were
most

most unreconcilable to *Rome*, and to engage the other to persecute and destroy them, that it might not be done as by the Papists, but they might seem their Fellow-Dissenters, and might come whenever the Necessity of others should open the Door.

The King had the Choice of the Bishops, and Deans and other Church Preferments, and of the Masters of Colleges, and of the Judges, and other Civil Powers and Honours: Accordingly he made those Bishops, Deans, Masters of Colleges, &c. who were known to be the most obedient to his Will, and the greatest Enemies to those called Puritans, and those that *Philanax* the Papist called *Protestants of Sincerity*. And by the help of the Lord Chancellor, *Morley*, *Sheldon*, and the rest, got the mastery of all the Dependent Clergy, when it was seen that all their preferments came much by their Wills. And that those called Puritans, and Presbyterians might end with that Generation they laboured to place all the Students in the Universities, under such as would possess them with the greatest contempt and hatred of those men, and to perswade them that all that Conformed not to all their Oaths, Covenants and Impositions, were but a pack of Fanaticks, Schismaticks and Rebels. And by their great Industry the Universities, Dignities and Clergy in most Power, were much thus constituted. And the Nonconformists being men who were noted for more seriousness in Religion than the common sort of men, and accordingly for a more serious way of Praying, Preaching, Discoursing and Living than the Multitude of Hypocrites, that are Religious but as far as pleaseth their Bellies, their Purses, and their Masters,

sters, it unhappily fell out that the doors of Preferment being open to those that had no Scruple of Conscience against any of the imposed Covenants or Practices, the main Body of those that had truly no Religion, became an engaged Party against the Nonconformists, and took the powerful Bishops for their Captains, and so Prelacy and Hypocrisie, and Prophaneness united their Interests, and became the strength of one another: And this is become the fatal Odium of Prelacy among the most Religious of the Land, and I fear will either finally root it out, or a Worldly Prelacy confederating first with the Prophane, and after with the Papists, will root out from the Publick Churches true serious Religion.

s 7. From first to last King *Charles* shewed his own Judgment, I. In his Declaration for Toleration at *Breda*: II. When he granted us his Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs; which was to try whether we would consent to a commoner Toleration: In the Conclusion of the Day, the distaste fell on me. The Lord Chancellor drew out another Paper, desiring a Liberty of Religion for all others that lived peaceably: And said, He knew not what to think of it himself, but desired the Company to speak their Minds: Neither Lords or Bishops, or any of their Drs. said a word to it: After twice or thrice asking, no one answered: Dr. *Wallis* standing next me, said, [*I pray thee say nothing, It is an odious Business*] I forbore, till I perceived that they would take our Silence for Consent, and then I said [*May it Please Your Majesty, This reverend Dr. (Guning) just now accused us, as if we would let in Socinians and Papists: We suppose that this is not intended, as our deed.*] The

The King answered, [*There be many Laws against the Papists*] I replied, [*We understand this to be for a dispensation with those Laws.*] There was no more said, and that was the Conclusion of the day.

III. In 1662. came out a Declaration for Liberty of Religion, naming the Papists to have their part in it, but not a Toleration. I was desired to get the City Ministers to Subscribe a Thanksgiving for it: I told them, that it was the King's Work, and not to be done by us; But I knew it was the Bishops design to cast the Odium of a Toleration of Popery on the Nonconformists, while they would gratifie the King, by forcing us to Consent; But they should never do it: They should do it themselves, or it should not be done. And it presently died.

IV. The Lord *Bridgman* called Dr. *Wilkins*, and his Chaplain Dr. *Hez. Burton*, and Dr. *Manton* and me, and Dr. *Bates* (after) as by the King's Order, to attempt an Agreement, for a Comprehension to the Presbyterians, and a Toleration for the Independents. We agreed of the Comprehension *in terminis*, and Judge *Hale* drew it up into the form of an Act: But when we came to the other part, the form proposed was for a *Toleration of all*, not excepting the Papists. I told the Lord Keeper, that we could not meddle in measuring out all other mens Liberty, but only to declare what we desired our selves: Others must be consulted about their own concerns, we were not for severity against any: But it was the King's Work, and we unmeet to be his Counsellors in it. And so all was cast off by the Parliament by that means, and the Act forbidden to be offered.

§ 8. At last the King himself broke the Ice, and Published a Declaration for Licensing a Toleration: The Cruelty of the Prosecution of the Nonconformists, being still the seeming Necessity for all: But the Parliament broke it, and it did the Papists much more harm than good; for the Nonconformists continued to Preach though Persecuted.

§ 9. The Clergy now would lay all the Severities on the *Parliament*, and wash their own hands as guiltless of all. But 1. It was *they*, even their *chief Bishops* and *Drs.* that when the King Commissioned them [*to Agree on such Alterations as were necessary to tender Consciences*] after all importunity, concluded that *no Alteration was so necessary.*]

2. And it was *the Bishops and Convocation* that altered the Book for the worse, and put in new matter harder than before.

3. And the Bishops in Parliament were the Chief Agents in all the Laws by which we are undone.

4. And it is known that it was the Interest of the Bishops and their Church way that engaged the Long Parliament in all their terrible Acts against us; *Viz.* The Act of Uniformity, the Acts for Banishment, the Five mile Act, the Corporation Act, the Militia Act, the Vestry Act, and others.

5. And who knoweth not that it is they and their Disciples that make the great stir, against our Healing in jealousy of their Interests, which nothing but their own over-doing is like to overthrow.

6. And

6. And when did they ever once Petition any Parliament to reverse the dividing wicked Laws? or to restore the Silenced Ministers? or to free them from dying with Rogues in Jails, or to prefer the Ministers of Jesus, before *Barabbas*? or to request that the Eminent Ministers of Christ might have no greater Punishment for Preaching Christ, than debauched Whoremongers, Drunkards, Swearers and Blasphemers usually have in *England*.

7. Yea, if a Godly Conformist do but write against their Cruelty to the Nonconformists (such as are Mr. *Pierce*, Mr. *Jones*, Mr. *Bold*,) they have for it Persecuted him as if he were a Nonconformist himself. And that you may know that it is not the old Church-men, nor yet a few single Persons, when Dr. *Whitby* Prebend of *Salisbury* who had wrote against Popery, did write an excellent Treatise for Peace and Reconciliation, the *Oxford* University Decreed the Publick burning of it (together with my Holy Commonwealth: The Lord Convert and Pardon them, that they prove not the burned fewel, when Reconciliation and a Holy Commonwealth are prosperous.) &c. God shall judge at last.

§ 10. All this time (from *Laud* till now), it is a hard Controversie which of the two Parties is to be called, *The Church of England*? Both Parties pretend to it, and some call both of them, the same Church. But the Infamous *Roger L'Estrange* set the Name of Trimmers on the old and reconciling Party, pretending that the other were, the Genuine Members of the Church; And was employed by his Genius, and the Court, and the Papists, and the New Clergy-men, to do a work so truly

Diabolical, as I never read of the like in History; even for many Years together to Write and Publish twice a Week a Dialogue called Observations, mainly levelled against Love, Peace and Piety, to perswade all men to *hate* their Brethren, and to provoke men to destroy them whom he Nick-named *Whigs*, and to render odious all save the Wolves (whom he called *Tories*, as if he owned the Irish Robbers); so that a Trimmer with him was the same as a Peace-maker, Blessed by Christ, and Cursed by *L'Estrange*.

§ II. But whether the New Clergy or the Old be the Church of *England*, and whether both be of *one Church*, remaineth still doubtful: But whoever hath the Name, that one Name is equivocal when applied to Parties contrary and inconsistent. 1. That Church which owneth a Foreign Government and Jurisdiction, cannot be one and the same with that Church which renounceth and abhorreth it, and owneth only Christ's Universal Government, and a Foreign Concord and Communion. But this is the difference between the Old Reformed Church of *England*, and the New that call themselves the *Church*. Two Kings make two Kingdoms: For the Form denominateth: And the Relative *Union* of the *pars Imperans*, and *Subdita*, is the Form.

That Church which hath a Human Head above National, must have a Form and Name above National: that is, Above a Church of *England*: which makes them all talk so much of [*The Universal Church*] in this false humane Form. An Universal Church hath an Universal Sovereign Power; which is only Christ. If the Pope be Antichrist, it is his claim of this that maketh him

him so, because it is Christ's Prerogative, which no mortal Man or Council or College is capable of. And if so, is it not a Papal or Antichristian Church that these Foreign Subjects own and are of? whether it be of the French or Italian Form, if one be Antichristian, both are so; when the Claim of Universal Jurisdiction is the Cause.

I have voluminously detected the mistake of these deceived Men, who are deluded by the Name Oecumenical, Catholick and Universal, which they find in the Councils and Fathers; and fully proved to them, that it signified no Councils above the Imperial or National; But distinguished those that were Universal in that one Empire, from the Provincial.

2. The Reformed Church of *England* taketh the Parish Communicants to be true Churches, and the Pastors to have as much of the Oversight as is necessary to the Constitution of a true Political Church. (Though their Canons sinfully fetter them in the Exercise.) But the Foreigners hold the Diocesses to be the least or lowest Churches, and the Parishes to be no true Churches for want of Bishops in them, but only Parts of a Church, that hath a Bishop over them all.

3. The Old Church of *England* owned the Foreign Protestant Churches as true Churches, and their Ministers as true Pastors, and own Communion with them. But the Innovators say, that they have no true Bishops, because they have not Diocesans, and are no true Pastors if they have not an uninterrupted Succession of Diocesane Ordination from the Apostles; whereas for some Hundred Years after the Apostles, there was no such Bishops known in the World, as were not either

Congregational (Parochial) Bishops, or Apostolick Overseers of such: and no Diocesans over many Hundred or Score Parish Churches, that had no Bishops under them.

§ 12. When you consider what Power the New Foreigners had at Court, and with the Parliament that made the Act of Uniformity, and required Re-ordination, and that made all the other persecuting Acts; and with the Justices that executed them: And when we see how they promoted the Roman Interest; and when we see how potently and obstinately they frustrated all attempts of the Protestant Union here, and read how they reviled the old Reforming Bishops (from *Parker* to *Abbots*) and the Parliaments as going too far from *Rome*; And when we consider that we have not one Bishop but who was chosen by *K. Charles II.* and *K. James*, and what Men they may be supposed to choose; we Contradict not these Men when they call themselves [the *Church of England*] But when we consider that the old Homilies, Apology, Articles, Liturgy, Canons, &c. were never yet repealed, and that they are all Sworn to Endeavour no Alteration of Government of Church or State, we have cause to think that the old Party have more right to be called *The Church*, the altering Endeavours having not changed its Essentials.

By this much the Reader may Expound whom I speak of in my Treatise of Episcopacy.

§ 13. The Church is nothing, but the Men that constitute the Church; If 1. It be denominated by their Numbers, no man can tell which Party hath the greater Number till they are further put upon the tryal. 2. If they are denominated by
Laws,

Laws, the better part are rather to be called the *Church*, because the Old Laws against Popery are not yet Repealed; Though yet some late Laws are to the Old, as poyson to a living Man: So if they be Denominated by Power, the Innovators have been the Church at least these 31 Years. For that Party Ruled, and had the Countenance of the Kings, who chose them. And indeed in the Days of the differing Emperors (*Constantine, Constantinus, Valens, Theodosius, Arcadius, Marcian, Leo, Zeno*, and the rest) that usually went for the Church or Orthodox party, which the Emperor owned: The uppermost will have the Name.

§ 14. Though the *French* and *English* (afore-said) designed a Coalition, the long possession of their different ways, unavoidably hindered them from an immediate Union; But they were forced to approach by leisurely Degrees: *England* would not suddenly turn the Liturgy to a Mass-Book, nor *France* suddenly turn the Mass-Book Corrected into *French*: But what fair Approaches were made, and what further intended, *Grotius* his Counsel Magnified by both Churches, and the present practices of the *French* declare.

The Council of *Grotius* was to bring down the Pope to Moderation, that he might Rule but by the Canons, and not be above Councils, nor deprive Kings nor Bishops of their Rights, and that the Lives of the Clergy be Reformed, and School Niceties left indifferent, and the *Lutheranes* as Reconcilable Courtied to a Concord, and the unreconcilable *Calvinists* brought down by force: But the *Lutheranes* are not so Reconcilable as they imagined; Princes that are once free, are loth to become Subjects to a Foreign Priesthood.

§ 15. And how much the *French* meant to bring down the Pope, their late Transactions shew a little, but their Doctrines much more: Mr. *Jurien* himself in his Posteral Letters (*Engl.* p. 216. 217.) thus Describeth them.

1. That the Church of *Rome* is no more than a Particular Church, as other Churches are. 2. That *St. Peter* had nothing but a Primacy of Order, and Presidence above the Apostles. 3. That *St. Peter* could give (to his Successor) over other Bishops, no more but that Primacy which he had over the Apostles. 4. That the Bishop of *Rome* Originally, and by Divine Right, had no Power over the Universal Church. 5. That he did not receive Appeals in the first Age of the Church. 6. That he had no Right to Assemble General Councils. 7. That he could take Cognizance of the Affairs of no other Provinces but his own; no not by Appeals. 8. That he had no Right to take Knowledge of Matters of Faith, to make Decisions therein; which should oblige the whole Church. 9. That before the Council of *Nice*, and after, he had no inspection over other Churches, but those which were in the Neighbourhood of *Rome*. 10. That he could not Excommunicate other Bishops, otherwise than the other Bishops could Excommunicate him. 11. That a Man might separate himself from the Bishop of *Rome*, without being a Schismatick, and out of the Church. 12. That the Pope had no Right over other Bishops. 13. That the Council of *Sardica* is the Fountain of that Right of receiving Appeals which the Pope claimeth. 14. That the Rights which the Pope hath at this Day, excepting his Primacy, are by Human Laws, and because

cause he hath assumed them to himself, and because they have bin conceded to him. 15. To which they add, he is not Infallible, nor Superior to Councils, nor Master to the Temporalities of Kings.] This is the *French* Religion, and who would think that this is Popery: No wonder if the Pope be more hearty for other Friends, than for *France*.

§ 15. Lay all this together, and it's Notorious that (though *Whetgift* and some other Calvinists were too much guilty of the Persecutions, to keep up the Dominion and Preferments which they were jealous of) yet it was the *French* Reconcilers that have set, and to this Day kept on foot our present increased Divisions and Dangers: Since *Le Strange* new-named them, the old Church Protestants are called *Trimmers*, and are Men that love not Division or Persecution, and would fain see a Coalition of Protestants; though they have not zeal enough (save too few) to put it on openly, lest they provoke the opposites. But the *Laudians* called *Tories*, are still as much against the Removal of the Dividing, Persecuting, Snares, and against the Coalition of English Protestants, on any possible healing Terms, as ever, and as fiercely seek the Continuance of our Slavery and Silence.

Chap. XXII. *How they have been stopt, and in what Danger we are yet of those that are for a Forreign Jurisdiction.*

§ 1. **T**HE continual Endeavours of Parliaments to Suppress all the Relicks and Advantages of Popery in Queen *Elizabeths* and King *James* Days, long kept this Papal inclination from appearing: And when *Land* raised it up, and King *James* and *Buckingham* Countenanced it, to promote first the *Spanish*, and after the *French* Marriage, the Articles of Liberty for Popery, Consented to by King *James*, and after Ratified by King *Charles*, greatly Distasted the Nobility and Gentry, and the People much more; so that the Kings and Parliaments were never after easy to each other, till King *Charles II.* got a Parliament fitted to his turn.

§ 2. The new raised Impositions of King *Charles I.* and *Land* first Exasperated the old conformable Clergy, by suspending and vexing them, for not reading the Book for Sports on the Lords Days, and for Preaching twice a Day, and by Altars and Bowing, and other Innovations: And the Severities against *Burton*, *Prin* and *Bastwick* made a murmuring noise; And the driving many hundred Families of Godly Men out of the Land, much more. And the newly Altered and Imposed Liturgy, Exasperated the *Scots*, who were Encouraged by the English Discontents: Yet all this had done the less, had not the same Church-Innovaters been against Parliaments, and kept them out, because Parliaments were against them: And had

had they not Preached for, and promoted the Kings power to Raise Taxes without a Parliament. But this leavened the Nation with an Averseness to the Frenchified Reconcilers. And the Scots knowing all this, began Resistance; which proceeded to a Mutual diffidence of King and People, which brought forth after a Civil-War.

§ 3. While the King and Parliament were Labouring under the Mortal Disease of mutual distrust, the *Irish* by an Insurrection, Murdered most Barbarously two hundred thousand Protestants, (just the day Twelmonth before *Edghil* Fight, *Dublin* escaped :) And this Horrid Cruelty hastened the War in *England*, and made Popery more odious than ever it was before; and rendered the *French* Conciliators more distasted.

§ 4. The Conciliators having the chief Ecclesiastical Power under King *Charles I.* and having too much Modelled the Churches and Universities to their Minds, the Parliament began a Reformation before the War, and carryed it on after, and cast out many Hundred for Insufficiency through gross ignorance, and for Drunkenness, and Vicious Lives: And some for being against the Parliament; and prospering till *Cromwell* cast them out, and *Cromwell* going much further against Prelatical Tyranny, and an ignorant Vicious Ministry than they, thirteen or fourteen or fifteen years time, not only stopt the *French* design of Coalition, but also wore out the chief designers and promoters of it: To which the Death of *Land*, with all the Accusations against him, struck deep: (of which see *Prins* Introductions, and his *Canterburies* Tryal.) And many old Conformists (which was all the *Westminster* Assembly
of

of Divines saving eight) were the Men that chose rather to put down the English Prelacy, than to run the hazard of the change of Civil Government and Introduction of Popery. So that both Popery, and the favorers of it, seemed quite cast out in *England*. But *Cromwell* and his Armies Usurpation and Treasons so Exasperated the two Kingdoms, both Episcopal and Presbyterians, that after his Death (his Army having cast themselves and the Land into Confusion) they brought in King *Charles II.* who by his Declaration from *Breda*, and his Treaty in 61 with the Nonconformists, and his Declaration 1662. (called *Bristols*) and by his Treaty with us by the Lord Keeper *Bridgman*, and by his Declaration for Toleration, still laboured so Strenuously to give Popery a Toleration, that discerning Men were satisfied that he was then of the Religion that he dyed in, (if he had any) or at least had engaged himself to introduce it: To which ends. 1. The dividing of the Protestants, 2. The Ejecting, Silencing, Ruining, Imprisoning or Banishing those of them that were most unreconcilable to Popery; 3. The keeping such out by new Impositions of Oaths, Subscriptions, Professions and Practices, were found to be the fittest means: 4. To which was added, the Exasperating the long Parliament (of Men before Exasperated) against them. 5. And the Declaring and Swearing the People against the Lawfulness of any Military Defence of Parliament or Kingdom against any Commissioned by the King. 6. And to bring all those that scrupled such Oaths, under the odious Name of Nonconforming Rebels, (Though they were all against Defensive War by any private Men or Faction; or for any Cause less than

than the saving of the Kingdom from apparent Ruine, Subversion or Alienation). 7. To which was added, the taking away of all Legislative Power from Parliaments, and appropriating it only to the King (the strenuous Endeavour of Bishop *Morley's* last Book against me, and of many others. 8. Which were all thought an unresistible force while the King, (of whatever Religion) had the choice of all the Bishops, Deans and Dignitaries, and consequently of that called *The Church of England*; 9. And also the choice of Judges, and the making of Lords. 10. And the changing of Corporation Charters.

§ 5. To these uses (that we may not accuse the Innocent) it was comparatively but a few men that were the visible prime Instruments, besides the non-appearing Jesuits or other Papists): That is, Chancellor *Hide*, Dr. *Sheldon*, Dr. *Morley*, Dr. *Guning*, whom not only Dr. *Hinchman*, Dr. *Cousins*, Dr. *Lany*, Dr. *Sterne*, and several others followed *ex animo*; but also most of the worldly sequacious part of the Clergy and Laity, for Interest and Preferment sake, when they saw that the Interest of *Sheldon* and *Morley* with the Chancellor, was a great and necessary means of obtaining their desires.

§ 6. But the bringing us to French Popery by the *Grotian* way, proved so slow by many stops, that it hath by God's Mercy been hitherto much frustrate and prevented. For the King must not make professed Papists to be Bishops, Deans and Convocation Men, lest the notoriety of the Design should raise unconquerable Offence and Opposition: The Name of *Popery* was to be renounced, even by those that were for a Foreign Jurisdiction:

dition : And a Government like that of the French Church must be said to be no Popery, but only that which made the Pope Arbitrary, or Supereminent above Councils: And the very retaining of the Name of Popery in their Renunciation, spoil'd their Game : And specially being necessitated to avoid Suspicion, to make divers firm Protestants, Bishops, Deans and Judges. Yet the slow way of *K. Ch. II.* was like to have been the surest, could their Patience have held out.

§ 7. But God used *K. James II.* as the great Instrument of frustrating all the Plot (till now); by his and his Instigators Impatience of this delay, and confidence of a more speedy way of Success: So that he resolved to put it to a speedy upshot, and would have all or none : which brought the Changes which we have since seen.

§ 8. But is the Church of *England* yet delivered from all the Inclination to a Foreign Jurisdiction, and the French Government? The Oath of Supremacy made it seem hard to perjure the whole Land, that had renounced all foreign Jurisdiction. But many devised an Expository Evasion (that only a Civil Jurisdiction was meant; though the Ecclesiastick also was named). Should there be but a new attempt by such as the former Rulers probably made, is it not like that Men of the French or Grotian Principles will promote it; yea, and be glad of French assistance?

I doubt they that would Perjure the Kingdom by a foreign Jurisdiction, will debate this odd Question.

Qu. Whether all that Profess or Swear that it is Unlawful on any Pretence whatever to resist the King, or any Commissioned by him in the Execution of that Commission,

Com
the
Nor

Cha
B

S
§ 1.

when
belie
Juris
cal,
vince
mon
confu
Wilia
on th
of it

1.
gainst

2.

raigne

whole

of Ch

are ca

is no

justly

Usur

is by

any, t

Univ
§ 2
ense

Commission, may resist a French Army if they Invade the Land by K. J's Commission? (Or will they turn Nonconformists?)

Chap. XXIII. *Postscript to the Reverend Dr. Beveridge.*

S I R,

§ 1. **T**Hough you were Bishop *Guning's* Witness (with *Dr. Saywell* his Chaplain) when he conferred with me, I was not willing to believe that you were of his mind for a Foreign Jurisdiction, either Aristocratical or Democratical, or Monarchical, but to my grief am now convinced of it, by your published Convocation Sermon: Having too copiously here and elsewhere confuted it (specially in my two Books against *William Johnson* alias *Terret* the Papist) I shall go on the supposition that you will there take notice of it: Especially of these two Reasons against it.

1. That the Kingdom and Church is sworn against it.

2. That a pretended Universal Humane Sovereignty or Legislative and Judicial Power over the whole Church on Earth, is the Grand Usurpation of Christs Prerogative; which no Mortal Men are capable of: And if this be not Popery, there is no such thing as Popery: And if the Pope be justly called *Antichrist*, or at least a Trayterous Usurper against the Right of Christ and Kings, it is by this: And if such a Power be really given to any, the Pope cannot be excluded, at least from the Universal Primacy.

§ 2. I doubt not but the Love of Unity and the Sense of the woful case of the Church by *Seas*,

Z

and

and sad Dissentions, engaged Bishop *Gunning* and you in the Opinions you took up : And no doubt but the Consciencious part of the Learned and Religious Papists are fixed by the same Motives in their way : I may say [fixed and very confident, or else they durst not carry it on as they have done in *France* and all other Popish Countreys. And I can say that I have not fixed on the denial of a Humane Universal Jurisdiction, without thinking seriously Forty years of what I could find said for it as well as against it ; nor out of an inclination to any contrary extreme : Could I have found but any Humane capacity in *One* or *Many* for such a Sovereignty, Legislative and Judicial, and but a possibility of such a thing, and any probability that it was of Christs Institution, the Love of Unity, and Hatred of Unruliness and Divisions, and their Effects had long ago made me a hot defender of it. But the contrary Truth, had contrary Effects.

§ 3. That you may not think that I differ from you more than I do, I here premise, I. That I doubt not but that the Universal Church visible is One Body or Society of professed Christians : As the Universal Church as Regenerate and Spiritual is One Body of sincere Christians.

II. That the Unity and Concord of it as Professors, and as sincere, must be maintained to the utmost of our power by all due lawful means.

III. That a wise Correspondency between all those Churches, which by nearness are capable of Acquaintance and Communication is a due means to preserve their Love and Concord.

IV. That seasonable and duly chosen Synods of many conjunct that live within the reach of such
Acquire;

Acquaintance and Communication may in case of true need be a fit means of such Concord.

V. That where such Synods cannot be had with due equality, Letters and Messengers from the several Nations or Provinces, or Churches may be used to that end.

VI. That the General Law of Christ commanding Love, Concord and Edification, maketh it a sin for any to affect causeless singularity, and to chuse any way which tendeth to Division: And that where there is an Equality, and no Regent power; yet just Contracts for Concord ought to be observed.

VII. That if in National Churches (that is, Christian Kingdoms or Commonwealths) the Sovereign Power give one Seat or Bishop a Primacy or peculiar Privilege, in the *Circa Sacra*, the Circumstantials of Sacred Offices, which are within the Magistrates Power, it ought to be obeyed.

VIII. If I had lived in the Christian Empire, when it sometime gave the Bishop of *Rome*, and sometime the Bishop of *Constantinople* this preeminence of degree, and the other Patriarchs (of *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jernsalem*) their several Privileges and Powers, not contrary to the Word of God, I would have obeyed that which the Emperor by his Law preferred.

IX. The Roman Empire was so great a part of the known Civilized World, and so Potent, that I quarrel not with the Titles of [*Orbis Romanus*] and [*Ecclesia Universalis*] given to that Dominion and Church which was meerly National or Imperial; so be it, we understand the true meaning.

X. Had the Empire continued one Polity, and had made the Bishop of *Rome* the Primate as to his Seat in Councils, and the said Bishop had been a capable Person, and had not Challenged the Government or Primacy in order of Regiment over the whole Christian World but in the Empire only, as the Archbishop of *Canterbury* doth in *England*, I would have been none of his opposers: All this I grant you.

§ 4. But (premissing for the Explication of Terms, that we take the words [*Regiment, Laws, Authority, &c.* in the proper political sense, and not equivocally for meer advice or consent) I add as followeth.

I. That as the Universal Church on Earth, hath but one Sovereign Jesus Christ, so it is one Body Politick, in relation to no one Unifying Head but Christ, and hath no one Substitute Vicarious Christ, or Substitute Sovereign Government, Monarchical, Aristocratical, Democratical or Mixt.

II. The Sovereignty of one Christian King, Emperor or Senate, (in Aristocracy) over an United or Confederate Christian Clergy and Laity as Subjects (each keeping to their own Place and Work) is the Unifying Headship of a National Church, which is nothing but such a Christian Kingdom or Republick: And that Christ hath owned such National Church Power, and hath instituted and owned no Power of Humane Government over it on Earth: And therefore as pretending to Universal Jurisdiction is Treason against Christ, so the claim of Foreign Jurisdiction is Hostility against Kings and States.

III. That Foreign Councils of Bishops and Dyets of Sovereign Princes are Authorized for Com-

Communion for mutual Counsel and Concord by Contract and Agreement, and have no just Jurisdiction or Political Regiment over particular Sovereigns or their subject Congregations: Though in Councils they retain their proper Power at home.

IV. The Foreign Councils agreeing on things profitable to the common benefit of all, Gods own Law of Love, Unity, Concord, Edification and publick Regard and Peace, forbiddeth the particular Bishops and Churches causlessly to dissent and affect singularity: But if they agree on things hurtful and dangerous to any of the particulars, they are not to be obeyed, nor yet if they claim Jurisdiction instead of Communion and Contract: But every Prince and Pastor must Rule their own. As Kings will not own a Foreign King or Council of Kings, who shall Usurp a Sovereignty over them, much more if over all.

V. That all Forcing Power that the Clergy can claim by Canons or Mandates in Christian Kingdoms, is only from the Prince (or State) as they are authorized by him as his Officers, who only hath the power of the Sword; and not at all any part of their Pastoral Office. And therefore (as *Grotius* in that excellent Book *de Imperio sum. Potest. circa Sacra*, hath shewed) Clergy-Canons are no Laws, but directing Agreements.

VI. The Canons of the Greatest Councils called *General*, were Laws to none without the Empire, unless Foreign Princes or Pastors made them so: Nor to any within the Empire, but by the Sovereigns Act as they are forcing, and the particular Pastors as Directing.

VII. Before the Division and Ruine of the Empire,

pire, the Name of a General Council signified but an Imperial or National Council. They being called by the Emperors who had no further power, and only out of the Imperial Provinces, unless any odd Person came voluntarily in for help and advantage, which was rare. This I have at large proved in my two Books against *W. Johnson* alias *Terret*.) And, *Ecclesia Universalis* usually signified no more than Universal, National or Imperial. *Leo* meant no more when he called himself *Caput Ecclesia Universalis*, nor *Phocas* when he gave *Beniface* the Title of Universal Bishop: And when the Empire was divided it was the Treasonable Erection of Popery to feign that *Orbis Romanus* was *Orbis Universalis*, and that *Concilja Generalia*, and *Ecclesia Universalis*, meant extra Imperial and Universal Over-foreigners, and all the World: And this is still as the Foundation of Popery, so the common Cheat that pleadeth for Foreign Jurisdiction.

VIII. Though *Rome* was a meet Seat for Imperial Church Primacy while Emperors would have it so; as it hath no just pretence to the Government of Foreigners, so it is of all others most unfit for a Primacy or Presidentship in the Councils of Foreign Confederate Princes and Churches, because it claimeth so much more, even Foreign and Universal Regiment: Nor are Councils of such Bishops or Princes to be trusted with General Contracts, who claim such Jurisdiction.

A Primacy in Lawful Councils of Confederates would strengthen their claim of an Universal Jurisdiction till they openly renounce it.

And so would the use of a Senate or Council that pretendeth to the like power.

IX. Patriarchs

IX. Patriarchs and Metropolitans, and Provincials or Diocefans in one Empire or Kingdom, can for Number, Seat or Precedency, juſtly claim no power of Governing Foreigners; nor ſubject Biſhops of that Nation, but from the Sovereign.

X. Legislation is the firſt Eſſential power of Regiment: Therefore none can be an Universal Legiſlator that is not an Universal Rector.

XI. As an Universal Monarch (Eccleſiaſtical or Civil) is the abſurd claim of an Impoſſible thing, and open Hoſtility to all Chriſtian Kings and Churches, ſo an Universal Ariſtocracy in Councils or Patriarchs, and Biſhops, is yet more abſurd, as claiming a more notorious Impoſſibility than the Pope doth.

XII. An Universal power of Expounding or Judging of Chriſts Laws by Regent Authority, or of being ſuch Keepers of unwritten Laws, ſeemeth the moſt Eminent part of Legislation; it being more to be Judge what is Law, and to make or determine of the ſence, than to make the bare words: And ſo the Biſhops ſhould have a higher Regency than Chriſt: Official Judges Expound the Laws only in their limited Provinces, and for the deciding of particular Caſes; but not to be the Universal Determiners of the ſence to all others: None but the Law-makers can make an Univerſally obliging Expoſition.

XIII. The inſtance of the Apoſtles power will not prove an Inſtitution of a ſtated Universal Legiſlative Ariſtocracy, or Monarchy. For, 1. It is evident that Chriſt firſt choſe and inſtituted them, as his National Miniſters, by the number of Twelve related to the Twelve Tribes; and by the keeping up juſt that number after the coming

down of the Holy Ghost : And by his special Mission of *Paul*, *Barnabas* and others to the Gentiles, distinguishing their Apostleship from *Peter's* and the rest to the Jews.

2. When Persecution and the fall of the Jewish state, made the Apostles Office more Extensive, it was rather Indefinite than Universal: They were to go as far as they were sent, and were able.

3. The Church was then in so narrow Bounds as made that Extent easie, when now an Universal Humane Regiment is of *Natural Impossibility*, and so past rational Controversie.

4. Their power was not any further Legislative, than as they were Promulgators of Christs Laws, and Determiners of mutable undetermined Circumstances or Accidents.

5. They have no Successors in those extraordinary parts of their Office, which looketh like any part of Legislative power. Which parts are,
 1. Being Eye and Ear-witnesses of what Christ did and said committed to their Testifying and Predicating Trust. 2. Having a special Commission to teach all Nations his Laws, or what he commanded as the prime Promulgators. 3. As having the promise of the Spirit to Teach them all things, and bring all to their remembrance. 4. And having the Miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost to attest their Witness: As *Moses* had Successors in Executive Regency, but not as a Mediatorial Deliverer of Gods Law, which *Aaron*, *Samuel*, *David* and *Solomon* must obey and rule by, but had no power to alter words or sense, nor add any thing but undetermined Circumstances.

Yet as the Laws of Christ promulgate by the Apostles bind all Nations to whom they are revealed ; so we grant that the same Laws of Christ declared by Councils, or Preached by any single Minister, bind all to whom they come : And that every Minister (and Christian) being a Member of the Church Universal, his Doctrine tendeth to Universal Benefit which yet giveth him no Universal Regent Jurisdiction.

As I remember I have said all this before in my Letters to Bishop *Gunning* when you were his Second or Witness of our Conference : But the Invitation of your Discourse, which I shall now give you my thoughts of, maketh me think that this repetition is not unnecessary. If you will read *Mr. Th. Beverley's whole Duty of Nations*, you may see more of my Judgment.

Supposing your Book to be in the hands of the Reader, I shall forbear transcribing, and only tell you what I dissent from, and the pages where it is contained.

I. I dissent from your Opinion of a Humane Sovereignty as over the Universal Church on Earth, (whether you feign it to be Monarchical, Aristocratical, Democratical or Mixt, I matter not.)

II. Consequently I deny your Doctrine of such an Universal Legislative power in Man, and of any Humane Universal Laws.

III. And I deny all Foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, that is, That the Clergy of any one or many

many Foreign Kingdoms have a Legislative Regent power over any other King and Nation which give them not that power by a voluntary Subjection.

All these denied Doctrines you own, pag. 28. l. 7, 8, &c. p. 24, 25, 26, 21, 23, 19, 13, 14, 15.

My Reasons against the first are so many before repeated, that I must not again do that which is so oft done. Prove you a Universal Humane Polity (by Kings or Clergy) and I will easily prove that Aristocratical is worse than Monarchical, and less practicable: And if you think *Poper*y an unfit Name for it, I will prove it *Antichristian*, as the Treasonable claim of Christs Prerogative may be so called.

The Second Error falls with the first: For Legislation is the most Essential part of Sovereign power.

Your Third denied Opinion I hope all Protestant Kings and Kingdoms will continue to renounce. And seeing you know that this whole Kingdom is *Sworn against it*, (even all Foreign *Spiritual* and *Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions* as well as *Civil*,) in the Oath of *Supremacy*, (besides the many Oaths against alteration of Church and State Government) I hope you would not have the Nation stigmatized with the brand of PERJURY. If the Law for taking the Oath of *Supremacy* be repealed, the Law of God against Perjury is not repealed.

And whether it be Treason in it self against King and Kingdom, to set up the claim of a Foreign power over them, without their consent, the Judges know better than I. But I know that there be some wise men that cannot yet prove K.

James

James his Self-deposing, if this will not prove it, that he openly endeavoured to settle the Kingdom under a Foreign Jurisdiction against the Laws and against their Wills, and so to alienate the prime part of Sovereignty.

And should a Foreign Jurisdiction be asserted, we should all be confounded by the Impossibility of knowing *where* to find it, or how to use it, if it be Aristocratical: Where the Pope is may be known: But where to find a General Council of all the Christian World, or an Ecclesiastical Parliament or College, or the Major Vote of all the Churches we know not.

And seeing Bishops are all (save one) the Subjects of other Princes, blame not Kings to be unwilling to be *their* Subjects, when thereby they will be subjected to those Princes that Rule them, or can sway them by Preferments.

IV. And I believe not your Doctrine that the *Major part* must go for this Governing Church.

For, 1. It will never be agreed who be the Nations or Persons that are to be accounted *Parts*; all will claim a Right that are called Christians. And can all Christians or Ministers judge of their pretensions?

2. It is certain that the Greater part have often erred in Counsels, and out of them: The Case of the Arrians proveth it: And the Greater part of the Bishops have been sometime on one side, and sometimes of another, and have turned and returned in the same Age; as is notorious in the Cases of the Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, the Council of *Chalcedon*, owned and disowned, the *Tria Capisula*, the Case of Images, and others.

3. It

3. It is known that most of the Christian World at this day have no small number of Errors; the Greeks, Moscovites, Armenians, Abassins, Coptis, Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Maronites, Georgians, &c.

4. It is to be expected that the Countries nearest the Councils, and that have most numerous Bishopricks will have the Major Vote, when those far off, and that have large and few Bishopricks will have few Votes.

5. It is known that three of the five old Patriarchates have many Errors, yea, four of them differ from all the Western Churches, Papists and Protestants.

5. And it's certain that as we cannot be sure of the Major Vote all over the World, so God never gave the Major part the Sovereignty.

V. And your Foundation for all this in Politics is intolerably false; viz. [pag. 13. *In omnibus hujusmodi Societatibus pars omnis toti suo congrua, & pars minor majori consentanea esse debet. Hoc ratio suadet: Hoc jus naturale edicit: Hoc Communis hominum Consensus necessarium esse statuit. Adeo ut si quid à majori, multo magis quod à maxima cujusvis Societatis parte constituitur eodem pars reliqua constringatur, illudq; observare necesse habeat, si membrum manere & privilegiis illius Societatis gaudere velit. Quod cum in omnibus cujusunque generis Societatibus valet, multo magis in Ecclesia valere debet, quam omnium ornatissimam esse decet.*]

I am loth to English it, 1. I confess I find the like in Archbishop Land, and R. Hooker: So Non-conformable to each other is the Conforming Clergy. But it's downright Popularity or Democracy

mocracy of the worst sort ; And can such then cry down Republicans ? yea, and raise a suspicion of Nonconformists as Republicans ? O what a varficious sort of men do sometime appropriate the Name of the *Church* ?

2. It is true of no sort of Political Society in the World, but only of ungoverned Communities or Confederacies, except those by Contract turned a meer Community into the worst sort of Popular Politie : And in Aristocracies it is not the Major Vote of the whole Society that Ruleth, but of those few who make up *One Political Person* or Power. And yet could you appeal to Reason, Nature, and common Consent ?

3. It is against the Essence of the Government of this Kingdom ? Shall Kings, Parliament and Magistrates be bound to obey the Major part of the Kingdom ? No, nor King and Lords to obey the Major part of the House of Commons ? Nor Mayors and Bailiffs be bound to obey the Major part of the Cities and Corporations ?

4. It is contrary to God's Law of Nature and Scripture. God hath anticipated humane popular pretences of being either naturally Rulers, or the Fountain of Governing Power : For God hath instituted in Nature, the Genus of this Power, and so much of the Species as is to execute God's Laws : He hath made the Fifth Commandment : and as he alloweth not the Major part of the Children to govern Father and Mother, or of Scholars to rule their Masters, so neither of Subjects to rule the Sovereign or the Minor part.

5. It is contrary to Oaths that are taken by the Subjects of this Land.

6. It

6. It is contrary to the subscribed 39 Articles, that tell us of the Errors and Fallibility of Councils.

7. It is contrary to the Canons, especially those of 1640. that determined Kingly Power to be of God's Institution.

8. It is contrary to all the Writers and Fighters that were against Parliaments resisting the King. *Michael Hudson* hath most strongly wrote against it. *Dr. Hammond* against *John Goodwin* hath proved that the People have neither ruling Authority to Use nor to Give. How far then were *Bishop Morley* and such others from your Mind, who write that the Parliament themselves have no Essential part in Legislation, but only to prepare Matter which the King only maketh to be a Law? All the Clergy have subscribed to the King's unresistible Power, and a Law made to that purpose by the Parliament that settled your Conformity and Church.

9. Do you take the Major part of your Congregation to be your Governours? Or the Major part of the Diocess to Rule the Diocesane? Or are these no Societies?

10. Is it not contrary to the Oath of Canonical Obedience?

11. Are our Universities of this Mind; when *Oxford* burnt my Political Aphorisms, and *Dr. Whitby's* Book, and *Mr. J. Humfrey's*, as derogating from the Regal Power, when yet I abhor such a derogation as your Majority of the Society?

12. In a word, it is destructive of all Government: For the truth is, that Democracy in a large Kingdom is an Impossibility: The People cannot
all

all meet to try who hath the Major Vote : They can but choose their Governours, though called Representatives : And that is an Aristocracy : For to choose Governours is not to Govern. Even Rome was not a true Democracy : For the People had but a Negative part in Legislation, *S. P. Q. R.* conjunct having the Supremacy : And what were the People of one City to the whole Empire, which was the Politick Body ?

But how shall we know who constitute this Voting Society which you call *the Church* ? I know that the Papists appropriate that title to the Clergy ? But when it cometh to Practice (in Councils or out) how small a part have any but the Bishops ? Our Canons condemn those who deny the Convocation to be the *Representative Church* ? Who are the *real Church* which they represent ? Do they represent the Laity ? Or are they none of the Church ? How can they represent those that never choose them ? Patrons choose the Incumbents ; and the People choose neither Bishops, Deans, Arch-deacons or Proctors. Is it the King and Parliament that they represent ? I confess the King that chooseth Bishops may most plausibly be pretended to be represented by them. But are they indeed his Rulers and Lawgivers, and he their Subject ? Was *Moses* so to *Aaron*, or *Solomon* to *Abiathar* ? The King chooseth Justices, and Constables (mediately) but not to be his Governours but his Ministers. Or is the King and Parliament no Part of the Church of *England* ? Say so then, that we may understand you.

But if indeed you confess the Laity to be of this Voting Church (whose Major part by Nature, Reason, and the Consent of all the World must Govern

Govern us) I beseech you help us at last (after all our lost importunity) to know which of the Laity it is. Is it all that are in the Parishes? I doubt then that the Atheists, Papists, Sadduces, Deists, Hobbists, Ignorant, Irreligious Debauchees and Lads, will be our Rulers.

Is it only Communicants? Then the Parish Priest of one place will have a Church of one sort, and another of another sort? And how knoweth he in great Parishes who are his Communicants, when he knoweth not who or what they are? or whence they come, nor whether ever they came before? The Law is the likest test, which obligeth all to Communicate that will have a License to sell Ale or Wine, or, that will not lie in Jail; a place that few Love, and many would avoid at so cheap a rate as eating a bit of Bread, and drinking a little Wine. And shall the Majority of these be Rulers of Kings, Bishops and Pastors?

But what if you mean but the Major Vote of Bishops? (which it seems our Lower House of Convocation mean not). Verily, Sir, you must not too sharply blame the King of *England, Sweden, Denmark, &c.* if they be loth to be Subjects in so great a Matter as their Religion to the Clergy of *Italy, France, Spain, Poland, Germany, Moscovy, Constantinople, and Asia, Africa, &c.* while we know what Power their own Princes have over them?

And do not we know that there is no one common Language which they can use to understand one another as a College? Even of our great Learned Schoolmen few understood Greek: And few of the Greeks understand Latin (or true Greek

Greek either) And few Abassines, Armenians, Syrians, Moscovites, &c. understand either. If Christ hath been so defective a Legislator as to leave us to a necessity of Universal Humane Legislation, O let us not have them made by such *Babel Builders*. Let us have those that can meet together in less than an Age (whether their Princes will or no) and can learn in an Age to speak to one another.

Or if you first prove that Mortal Men are capable of such an Universal Government, try it first on Kings, and settle one King, or Senate of Kings to Rule all the World by Legislation and Judgment: For verily more of Sword-Government may be done *per alios*—than of Priestly Government (else you may appoint Presbyters to Ordain, and Lay-men to celebrate the Sacraments.) And if we must have a Vice-Christ, let him be a Monarch that we may know where to find him, and not a Chimera called a *Collective Person*, or College of Bishops: Or at least if it must be Patriarchs, let us know who shall make them, and where they are, and what we shall now do, when of five so called Four are called Schismatics and are under the Turk: Christ hath instituted National Church Politie: Prove more if you can.

VI. And I should rejoyce if you could prove what you affirm, that the Major part of the Church, even in Rites and Discipline, is guided by the Spirit of God. 1. It was not so in necessary Doctrine in the Arians reign. 2. If it be so at this day, *England* is Schismatical. 3. If it be not always so in General Councils (as the Articles of our Church say) how much less in the diffusive Body

of People or Clergy? 4. It is not so in any one Kingdom or National Church yet known in the World, no not the World; And what is the whole but the Parts Conjunct? Dr. *Dillingham* in a late Book against Popery concludeth, that there was never yet any Kingdom known where the tenth part were truly Godly: And I think you take the Church of *England* to be the best in the World: And how many Thousands would rejoyce if you could prove that the Major part even of their Teachers were guided by the Spirit of God? And is it better with the Papists, or Greeks, or Moscovites, that cannot Preach at all! O how happy a Church do you Dream of?

VII. And it is yet more incredible that this popular Majority should be so right in such small Matters as Rites and Ceremonies and Discipline, as that their Practice should be a Law to all the rest of the Christian World: And that the Unity or Concord of the Universal Church must be built on such Sand as cannot so much as be gathered into one Heap? And all must be Schismatics, and so far separate from the Church that obey them not: I remember when Dr. *Hammond* proceeded Dr. *I heard Dr. Prideaux* in the Chair argue against the Churches Infallibility, that *John*, and *Thomas*, and so every Individual was fallible: Ergo a company of fallibles were not infallible. Especially in such Matters as a Ceremony. Those that *Paul* wrote to *Rom. 14. & 15.* were not taken for infallible or Legislators by him.

VIII. And you no where prove that *Paul* meaneth by [the Churches have no such Customs] that
no one

none in the World had any other, nor must have any other; but only that what Garb and Habit the Custom of all those Countries had placed Decency in, the general Rule of *Decency* would oblige all to in the solemn Assemblies, as it obligeth us to be uncovered. You must needs know that by your Exposition and Inference you Condemn your own Church that hath the contrary Custom. Especially your noble Patrons that wear Periwigs.

IX. And how impossible a work do you set us all as a Law, to know what these Ceremonies are without which we separate as Schismatics.

1. Must all good Christians be so great Historians as to know what Ceremonies have been used in all Ages by the Major part?
2. Must they be so Skill'd in Cosmography, as to know what Countries make the Major part?
3. Must they have so good intelligence of former Affairs, as to know who have now the greater Vote in Councils and out of them?
4. But you say, It must be of such Rites as *ab omnibus, ubiq; & semper* have been used: we like *Vincentius Liri's* rule well as to things necessary, that may *aliunde* be so proved. But how shall any man know that *ab omnibus & ubiq;* without more Knowledge of the World than *Drake* or *Candish* had, or any Traveller? Except *Negatively*, that we must not affect causeless Singularity from the most of the Godly, as far as we can know them. And how shall we understand the *semper*? Must it respect all time to come? Then, none can know his Duty till the End of the World? If it be only as to *time past*, then how knew they that lived in the first Age, how long their Customs

A a 2

would

would continue ? And then all the after Changes (which were many) were Schismatical.

X. Do you not too hardly censure the Church of *England* as Schismatical ? You know *Epiphanius* hath a peculiar Treatise to tell us, what then were the Customs and Ceremonies of the Universal Church ? And how many of these are forsaken by us, yea, and by almost all the Churches ? Do you now clothe the Baptized anew in White ? Do you dip them over head in Water ? Do you anoint them as they did, and cross them with the Ointment ? Do you give them to taste Milk and Honey ? Do you exorcise them ? Do your Bishops only make that Chrysm ? Do all here and in other Churches worship only *versus Orientem* ? Do you all forbear, and forbid Adoration Kneeling, on any Lord's Day, or any Week Day between *Easter* and *Whitsunday* ? What! when you cast out of the Church those that will not Kneel at the Sacrament ? You know that the Council of *Nice*, and that at *Trull*, and the Fathers commonly make this a Rite of the Universal Church : And Dr. *Heylin* saith, that *Rome* it self kept it for a Thousand Years, and it was never reversed by any other General Council. Do you keep the Memorial of Martyrs at their Graves as then they did ? Do you use their Bones and reliëts as they did ? Twenty more you may see in *Epiphanius* and others.

O condemn not the Church of *England*, as separated from the Universal Church. (And our Reformers too.)

XI. What a case would you bring this Church and Kingdom to, by your Law of the Custom of the

the Major part ? Must we have all the Opinions, Rites or Ceremonies which the Greeks, Moscovites, Armenians and Papists have many Hundred Years in their Ignorance and Superstition agreed in as to the Major part ? Must we be able to confute their pretensions of Antiquity and Custom as to all these ? He that readeth the Description of their Customs, methinks, should be loth that we should be such.

XII. And your Doctrine of *Traditions* as certainly received from the Apostles, when the Majority use them, is so much against the Church of England's Judgment, and so copiously confuted by the whole stream of Protestant Bishops and Drs. and foreign Divines, that I will not stay now to repeat that work : were all the Traditions forementioned since laid by, received from the Apostles ? (About Genuflexions, Milk and Honey, Chrysome, the white Garment ?)

You instance in Synods meeting and making Laws. To meet for worship or necessary consultation and Concord, is no unwritten ceremonial Tradition, but the obeying of Christ's written Law, which requireth such mutual help, and that we do all to Edification, Concord and Peace. But *Communion* of many Nations is one thing, and a Government over all is another thing. It was the Emperor's Commission and Power that made Canons to be Laws.

And do you not here write against the King's Commission by which you sit, which declareth from that Act of H. 8. that your Canons are no Laws, till King and Parliament make them so ? Ask the Lawyers. Were not the Canons of

1640. cast out even by your own long Parliament ?

XIII. But the worst is, that while you set us a new Universal Church Legislative and Judicial Sovereignty, you deny the sufficiency of Scripture, if not the Sovereignty of Christ himself, while you feign unwritten Universal Laws, as part of Christ's Law, & a supplement to the Scripture, & give Christ's Prerogative to a Usurping Sovereignty, utterly uncapable of that Office ? Scripture we know where to find ; but where to find your Universal Additional Laws, and your Church Senate or College, they must know more than I that know. But so much is written against the Papists (as aforesaid) for Scripture sufficiency, that I refer you thither, and to the Articles, Homilies and Ordination Books which this Church subscribeth to. Alas Sir, is not the whole Bible big enough to make us a Religion ?

XIV. As to your definition of the Church, P. 12. It is tolerable if you make no Head but Christ ; and set up no Vicarious Head Monarchical or Aristocratical, and instead of Provincial parts, put National and Congregational ; or confess that you describe but the Imperial-National Church, which was made up of Roman Provinces. And gratifie not the Fanaticks by making the Holy Ghost to be the authoriser of the Majority for Government : For they will think that they have more of the Holy Ghost than you, and therefore must Govern you. I would all Rulers had the Holy Ghost ; but it's somewhat else that must give them Authority.

XV. Your

XV. Your instance of the *Easter Controversie* is against you. The difference undecided for 300 Years, and Apostolical Tradition urged on both sides, tells us that it was no Apostolick Law; And *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell us, that in that and many such like things, the Churches had freely differed in Peace. And you seem to intimate contrary to them and to *Irenaeus*, that the *Asians* were Schismatics till they Conformed.

And why name you *Asia* alone? Were our British Churches, and the Scottish no Churches? Or do you also Condemn them as Schismatics for about 300 Years after the *Nicene Council*? What could the Papists say more against them?

XVI. How impossible a thing do you make Church Union to be? while the Essentials or great Integrals of Religion are made insufficient to it, and so many Ceremonies and Church Laws are feigned necessary, which no man ever comes to the true knowledge of, that he hath the right ones and all?

XVII. If the Patriarchs must be the Sovereign College, I beseech you give us some proof (in a Case so weighty) 1. How many there must be? 2. Where seated? 3. Who must choose and make them? 4. And *quo jure*? 5. And whether we have now such a College; or is there no Church?

XVIII. What Place will you give the Pope in the College? I suppose with your Brethren you will call him 1. *Principium Unitatis*? But that's a Name of Comparative Order? what is his work as such a *Principium*? How is he the *Principium*, if he have no more Power than the rest? Must not he call

the Councils ? (Though our Articles say General Councils may not be gathered without the Will of Princes). Shall he not choose the Place and Time ? Tell us then who shall ? Must he not be President ? Must he not be Patriarch of the West ? And so Govern *England* as our Patriarch, and *Principium unitatis Universalis* also ?

XIX. I pray tell us whether the *French* be Papists ? And how their Church-Government (as Described from themselves by Mr. *Jurien*) differeth from that which you are for ? Tell me not of their Mass, and other Corruptions ? It is *Government* that is the Form of Popery. And they will abate you many other things : And must we be Frenchified ? If the *French* restore those that we called Papists, will disowning the Name, and calling them the *Church of England* (chosen by Papist Princes) make us sound and safe ? And when we find Arch-Bishop *Laud*, Arch-Bishop *Bromhall*, Bishop *Guning*, Bishop *Sparrow*, Dr. *Saywell*, Dr. *Heylin*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Bishop *S. Parker*, and many more were for a Foreign Jurisdiction, can we think if the *French* bring in the late Governours, that such Churchmen would not embrace the *French Church Government*, and call it the *Church of England*, when since *Lauds* days, they have endeavoured a Coalition ? If they be Defeated, we may thank King *James*, who could not bear delays, and would have all or none, when *Grotius* way would have been a surer Game.

XX. You tell us of Penalties made by Church Laws ? Deposing Ministers, and Anathematizing the

the Laity ? But while the Clergy hath no power of the Sword, who will feel such Penalties ? When *Rome* Excommunicates the *Greeks*, the *Greeks* will Excommunicate them again : What Penalty is it to Protestants to be Excommunicated by the Pope or his Council ? How commonly did they that were for, and against the *Chalcedon* Council, Excommunicate each other : And those that were for and against Images ? And for *Photins*, and for *Ignatius* ? Cheat not Magistrates to be your Li- citors, and Cursing will go round as Scolding at *Billingsgate* ? Who is hurt by a causeless curse, but the Curser ? I confess that Dr. *Saywell* sayeth well ; If single persons must be punished, shall not Na- tions also ? Yes : But by whom ? By God the Universal King, and not by an Universal Human Sovereign ; whether a King or Pope, or a Senate of Foreign Subjects :

XXI. We are promised by a trifling Pamphle- teer (that some of you are answering Mr. *Clerk- sons* two Books about the *Primitive Episcopacy* and *Liturgies* : I pray you procure them also to answer my Treatise of *Episcopacy*, (and my *English Non- conformity*) and not with the Impudent Railing Lyars, to say it is answered already, while we can hear of no such thing. And see that they prove that all these things following, are *Traditions* of the *Universal Church*, received from the Apo- stles, and used, *ab omnibus, ubique & semper*.

1. That most particular Churches for two Hun- dred or three Hundred years and so down, con- sisted of many Congregations that had no perso- nal presential Communion.

2. That Churches *infimi ordinis* were Diocesan, having

having many Hundred or Score Parishes under them.

3. That these Diocefans, undertook the sole Pastoral Care of all these Parishes, as to Confirmation, Censure, Absolution, and the rest.

4. That all these Parishes were no true Churches, as having no Bishops, but the Diocefans, and were but Chappels, or parts of a Church.

5. That the Incumbents were no true Pastors or Bishops, but one Bishops Curates: And that there were not then besides Dioceſan Arch-Bishops in each single Church, *Episcopi Gregis* and *Episcopi praesides*.

6. That Bishops Names were used by Lay-men that had the Decretive Power of Excommunication and Absolution.

7. That such Secular Judicatories, far from the Parishes, rather than the particular Pastors Tried and Judged the unknown people.

8. That Parish Ministers Swear Obedience to the Diocefans, and they to Metropolitans.

9. That all People that would have Licenses to keep Ale-houses or Taverns, or that would not lye in Jail, were Commanded to receive the Sacrament as a Sealed Pardon of their Sins.

10. That from the beginning, all Churches were forced to use the same form of Liturgy, and not every Church or Bishop to choose as he saw Cause.

11. That Kings chose Bishops and Deans without the Consent of the Clergy and People. 7

12. That all Ministers were to be Ejected, and forbidden to Preach the Gospel, that durst not Subscribe that there is nothing contrary to Gods Word in such as our three imposed Books.

13. That

13. That all Lords, Magistrates, Priests and People that affirm the contrary, be *ipso facto* Excommunicate.

14. That Lay-Patrons that are but Rich enough to buy an Advowson (how Vicious soever) did choose all the Incumbent Ministers, to whom the People must commit the Ministerial Care of their Souls.

15. That they that dare not trust such Pastors as are chosen by Kings (though Papists) and such Patrons, and dare not Conform to every imposition like ours, must live like Atheists, in forbearance of all publick Worship and Church Communion.

16. That all may Swear that an Oath or Vow of Lawful and Necessary things, bindeth not our selves or any others, if it be but unlawfully imposed and taken, and had any unlawful part of the Matter.

17. That the Church ever held it unlawful for a whole Kingdom to defend it self against a Prince that would deliver up half the Government to a Foreiner, and force them to a Religion which requirerh them to be Damned (or to Dye :) When the Clergy and Church at *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Rome*, &c. did so oft by force and Blood, resist even Christian Emperors, such as *Theodosius II.* *Zeno*, *Anastasius* and many others.

18. That all the Churches held it lawful to Swear and Covenant, never to endeavour any Amendment or Alteration of any such as the fore-mentioned Church Government.

If all these things be contrary to the constant judgment or practice of the Church, *Quare* whether Dr. *Beveridge* and his Approvers, pronounce
not

having many Hundred or Score Parishes under them.

3. That these Diocesans, undertook the sole Pastoral Care of all these Parishes, as to Confirmation, Censure, Absolution, and the rest.

4. That all these Parishes were no true Churches, as having no Bishops, but the Diocesans, and were but Chappels, or parts of a Church.

5. That the Incumbents were no true Pastors or Bishops, but one Bishops Curates: And that there were not then besides Dioceſian Arch-Bishops in each single Church, *Episcopi Gregis* and *Episcopi praesides*.

6. That Bishops Names were used by Lay-men that had the Decretive Power of Excommunication and Absolution.

7. That such Secular Judicatories, far from the Parishes, rather than the particular Pastors Tried and Judged the unknown people.

8. That Parish Ministers Swear Obedience to the Diocesans, and they to Metropolitans.

9. That all People that would have Licenses to keep Ale-houses or Taverns, or that would not lye in Jail, were Commanded to receive the Sacrament as a Sealed Pardon of their Sins.

10. That from the beginning, all Churches were forced to use the same form of Liturgy, and not every Church or Bishop to choose as he saw Cause.

11. That Kings chose Bishops and Deans without the Consent of the Clergy and People.

12. That all Ministers were to be Ejected, and forbidden to Preach the Gospel, that durst not Subscribe that there is nothing contrary to Gods Word in such as our three imposed Books.

13. That

13. That all Lords, Magistrates, Priests and People that affirm the contrary, be *ipso facto* Excommunicate.

14. That Lay-Patrons that are but Rich enough to buy an Advowson (how Vicious soever) did choose all the Incumbent Ministers, to whom the People must commit the Ministerial Care of their Souls.

15. That they that dare not trust such Pastors as are chosen by Kings (though Papists) and such Patrons, and dare not Conform to every imposition like ours, must live like Atheists, in forbearance of all publick Worship and Church Communion.

16. That all may Swear that an Oath or Vow of Lawful and Necessary things, bindeth not our selves or any others, if it be but unlawfully imposed and taken, and had any unlawful part of the Matter.

17. That the Church ever held it unlawful for a whole Kingdom to defend it self against a Prince that would deliver up half the Government to a Foreiner, and force them to a Religion which requireth them to be Damned (or to Dye :) When the Clergy and Church at *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Rome*, &c. did so oft by force and Blood, resist even Christian Emperors, such as *Theodosius II.* *Zeno*, *Anastasius* and many others.

18. That all the Churches held it lawful to Swear and Covenant, never to endeavour any Amendment or Alteration of any such as the fore-mentioned Church Government.

If all these things be contrary to the constant judgment or practice of the Church, *Quare* whether Dr. *Beveridge* and his Approvers, pronounce
not

not the Church of *England* Schismatical, as so far separated from the Church Universal?

But again I conclude, O! What, must the Christian World suffer even by Learned, and I hope pious Doctors?

I. Because they will not distinguish *National* or *Imperial* *Universality* of Church and Councils, from those of the whole World.

II. Nor *Communion* from Regiment, nor *Contracts* from Laws; nor a Regent *Excommunication* from a Renunciation of Communion by *Equals*.

III. Nor Divine Obligations to Concord, and human demands of obeying Usurpers, or the hurtful Agreements of an injurious Majority of equal Votes.

IV. And by their Deposing Christian Kings and Magistrates from their Sacred Power over Bishops in Church-Government, and for Mens Souls; as if they were made only for the base things of the World and Flesh, and Priests only were trusted with Religion and Souls: And Kings were not Heads of National Churches.

V. And their shameless calling them *Adversaries* to *Episcopacy*, that would have one Hundred Bishops for one, and are for the old three sorts, *Episcopi Gregis*, *Episcopi presides*, and Arch-Bishops and calling those the *Episcopal* part, that put down all the Bishops in a Diocese save one; As for your self, I profess to be so far from Censuring any thing of you, save these Mistakes, that as I have long, so I do still, Love and Honour you as a Man fearing God, and of a good and blameless Conversation, as far as ever I Credibly heard: And I thought the like of Bishop Gunning, though (as it is with many Religious Papists) his Opini-

ons

ons more prevailed against his Charity, for that Mischievous hurtfulness, in which he served the Subtilty of *Sheldon*, and the fierceness of *Morley*, and the Designs of Papal Courtiers: But I hear that your Piety and Charity prevaieth against the evil tendency of your mistaken Doctrine: Though *Mr. Thorndike* threaten *England*, unless they Reform the Oath of Supremacy, I confess I wish it restored, and am Displeased with those *Scots* that have causelessly quarrelled with it; and so helpt to open a Door to a Foreign Jurisdiction, which the Kingdom is Sworn against.

Since the writing of all foregoing, I first read your two great Volumes of Canons, and your Answer to *Dallaus*. In the *Prolegomena* of the first, to my Grief I find you more exprefs for an Universal Legislative Power and Foreign Jurisdiction than in your Sermon: And yet not at all telling us, where to have access to this Universal Sovereignty for Judicature, out of the times of General Councils, nor how to know but by believing your bare word, what Councils are our Universal obliging Laws, when you confess the vast difference of the *Eastern* and *Western* numbers, nor how to know what our Religion is, while we know not what be our Laws: Nor how to know whether the Church be extinct, when it hath no human Head, by the Cessation of such Councils; nor who must call them, nor whence, nor what is their Constitutive Matter; only you say, they must be called out of all the Christian World: But need not all be there? And will a Call make a General Council, if the Men come not? And can they come from all the Dominions of the *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Turks*, *Persians*, *Muscovites*,

covites, &c. And who hath right to call them? hath the Pope? Or our Emperors or Kings? what power hath he over all other Princes Subjects? You confels they were called out of the Imperial Provinces? And how few (if any) other Names are Subscribed? But I am sorry that you still, so contrary to all Evidence, take National or Imperial Universality for Terrestrial Universality of Church and Councils: I beseech you, if we must be Papists, let us be of the more reasonable sort, that know where to find a Papal Monarch, or Vice-Christ; and not sent to seek a Church-Parliament Universal, or Universal Aristocratical College, that is no where extant in the World, nor can be, especially now the five Patriarchs are what and where they are. How much more Rational to be Governed by the Pope as Patriarch of the West only, till we can find out the Aristocratical Head.

But since the Empire was turned into many Kingdoms, who can prove that those many must have all one Human Head.

But I am yet more sorry that you joyn with *Hildebrand*, in making Princes to be but for the Body and Civil Peace, and Bishops and Priests to be the Church, and for the Soul: Which (God willing,) as I have oft done, I shall fullier Confute, in a Treatise for true National Churches, proving that Christ hath made no Higher Visible Humane Church Power or Form: And that Christian Kings are as Sacred Persons, and Ministers of Christ as Bishops; and Superior Heads of National Churches, though the Power of the Keys belong only to the Clergy; And that a true National Church, is but a Christian Kingdom, as such, the King being the Head, and Confederate Pastors and Churches the Subject Body.

The Second Part.

The Stating of the Contro-
versie, and full Confuta-
tion of the Pretences for
a Foreign Jurisdiction.

The CONTENTS:

Chap. I. *The clear stating of the Controversie, and Confutation of the Pretenders. In 60 Propositions; proving it a perjurious alteration of Government, &c.*

Ch. II. *Why Parliaments and the Church of England before Bishop Laud were so much against such a Coalition with the Papal Church.*

Ch. III. *The said Coalition is not the way to Catholick Union.*

Ch. IV. *The Deceits that are pleaded for an Universal Hamane Sovereignty.*

Ch. V. *A Foreign Jurisdiction by College or Counsels unmaskt.*

Ch. VI. *The Grand Consequential Case: Whether it be lawful for Presbyters to Swear or Profess Obedience to those Bishops who profess Subjection to a Foreign Jurisdiction? or for the people to own them.*

Ch. VII. *Of the second part of the design to bring the Papists to our Churches as in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's days.*

Ch. VIII. *Why it will not serve for a Coalition for the Papists to abate their last 400 years corruptions as Archbishop Bromhall maintaineth.*

Ch. IX. *Whether the instance of the Apostles Church Government, prove an Universal Sovereignty in man.*

Ch. X. *Many Questions about Councils to be resolved before we can take them for an Universal Aristocracy.*

Ch. XI. *A Breviate of both the Aristocratical and Monarchical Popery.*

Ch. XII. *A humble Expostulation to the Zealous Antipapists, Conformists and Nonconformists whether they have been innocent as to promoting Popery?*

Ch. XIII. *What is the Duty of all other Christians towards the Papists, in order to the discharge of the Fundamental Duties of Love, Concord and Peace, and the promoting the common Interest of Christianity: Written to keep Protestants from sinful Extreams, and while we cannot come so near them as Cassander, Erasmus, Grotius, and those that are for a Foreign Jurisdiction, we may keep and use a Christian Zeal for the better way of Concord of Christs prescribing, avoiding all injury to Papists, and all others.*

NB. To prevent misunderstanding Citations, note, That both some Episcopal Drs and some Presbyterians say, That the Government of the Church is Aristocratical, meaning only, 1. *Per partes*, as England is Governed by Justices, and, 2. Meeting in such Councils as they can for Concord: But not as the *summa potestas* of the Universal Church which is *una persona politica in pluribus naturalibus* unifying the Body and so Ruling it. They speak not properly in the Language of Politicks.

Chap.

Chap. I. *The true State and just Resolutions of the Controversies about a Foreign Jurisdiction, in Sixty Evident or Proved Propositions.*

§ 1. **H**OW great advantage Satan maketh of the deceivableness of ignorant men, and of the *deceitfulness* of the Crafty, and of the aptitude of ambiguous, or false, or artificially-contrived Names and Words to deceive, the sad Experience of the deceived World, and corrupted and divided Churches openly declare; and yet, alas, how few observe it and escape the snare?

§ 2. If all Men were judicious and stablished Christians, when serious Faith and Godliness is made a scorn, by the false names of Hereticks, Schismatics, Puritans, Fanatics, Sectaries, or any senseless jeers, it would no more turn them from the holy performance of their Baptismal Vow, and Obedience to Christ, than the raving of a Drunkard or a Bedlam, or the crying of a Child. But ignorant unresolved Persons, that never yet know what the bearing of the Cross was, nor have learned self-denial, are stopt in their convictions, good purposes, and hopeful dispositions, when they hear serious Piety made a common scorn, and that by those that were themselves Baptized, and profess Christianity. Some of them think, sure all this reproach is not laid on them for nothing, and others that think it but the stink-

ing breath of ulcerated malignant minds, yet cannot bear it, but draw back and shrink : Therefore Christ pronounceth a dreadful Sentence against those that offend (that is, by such stumbling-blocks turn back and discourage) even the least of these childish beginners ; *It were better for that man that a Millstone were hanged about his Neck, and he were cast into the Sea.*

§ 3. But no scandal or snare is so dangerous as those which are made by Rulers or Great Men, or by Pastors and Teachers on the pretences of Religion, and Divine Authority, abusing the holy Name of Christ.

§ 4. And the same Artifice that Satan useth against Godliness in general he useth against particular *Truths, Duties and Persons.* And one of the most dangerous that I now perceive the Protestant Religion assaulted with, is putting the *Name* of *Nonconformists*, and *Puritans*, and *Schismaticks*, on Protestants as Protestants, and the Name of *Catholick*, the *Church*, the *Church of England*, the *Clergy*, yea of the *Reformed Church*, and of Protestants on the *Papal Roman Sect.* The *Church of England*, *King*, *Parliament*, *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, and the rest were sixty years ago and less against that as *Popery*, which now is obtruded on us as the sense of the *Church of England* against *Popery* : Such Wonders can bare Names do with the ignorant : And they go on without any great resistance.

§ 5. Whereas there are great differences among the Papists about the degree of the personal Power of the Pope, the Cheat is this ; To confine the Name of Papists to the one party, and to own the Opinions of the other Party, and to call them
Presbyterians

Presbyterians or Nonconformists that are against both, and will be no Papists. 1. The Italians are for the Popes Sole Supremacy, and Councils being but his Counsellors. 2. The French Lawyers are for the Councils Supremacy above the Pope, as to Legislation, and Judgment when they sit. 3. The middle greater part are for the Supremacy in Pope and Council agreeing, and the Popes Executive power in the intervals, not absolute, but according to the Church Laws or Canons. But all for a visible Universal Supremacy, and for the Papal Presidency in General Councils, and his prime Patriarchship in the West. If in *England* some be for the Kings Sole Legislative Power and Absoluteness, and Parliaments being but his Counsellors; and others for the Conjunction of King and Parliament in Legislation, and the limiting of the Kings Executive Power by the Laws, doth it follow that only the first sort are the Kings Subjects? The Controversie is the same. Yet the same men that are for Absolute Civil Monarchy, take on them to be for Ecclesiastical Aristocracy.

§ 6. Men love not to be tired with tedious Volumes; nor can I find time to write more such, therefore I shall here lay down what the Reader must necessarily know in some Theses or Aphorisms, with so short but sound a proof as is necessary to capable willing Readers, instead of putting them into distinct Chapters with numerous proofs to urge the unwilling.

I. The World is the Kingdom of God; who is Eminently the King, and all Reasonable Creatures his Subjects under Moral Government, as all natural Agents are under Natural Potential Government.

No man will deny this but the Atheist, whom I leave to be disputed with by Sun, and Moon, and Stars, Heaven and Earth, and common Reason.

II. God only is the Unifying as well as Specifying Governor of this Universal Kingdom; and tho' all men be of one Nature, Species, Mould, Interest, &c. yet it is only by their Relation to one God that they are one Kingdom.

III. God hath made no Universal Supreme Monarch or Aristocracy under him in the World: But only appointed to each Sovereign his particular Province or Republick. For, 1. No Man or Senate is naturally capable of it: They do not so much as know the *Terra incognita*, nor can send to the Antipodes and all the Earth as Regiment requireth: He would be thought as mad that should attempt it as he that claimed a Kingdom in the Moon. 2. No Man or Senate had ever yet the madness to claim it.

IV. He that should Claim an Universal Supremacy, must thereby make all Kings and States, and all the World to be his Subjects.

V. He that doth so proclaimeth himself to be *publicus hostis*, the *publick Enemy* of all Kings and States, while he will make them *his Subjects against their wills*. And therefore all Kings and States are allowed to resist and use him as their common Enemy.

VI. The whole World is now the rightful Dominion of Christ our Redeemer: *For this end he both died, rose and revived, that he might be the Lord of the dead and of the living*, Rom. 14. 9. 10. *All power is given him in Heaven and Earth*, Mat. 28. 19. *All things are delivered to him of the Father, and*
given

given into his hands, John 13. 3. and 17. 2. He is made Head over all things to the Church, Eph. 1. 23. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, John 5. 22.

VII. Princes are therefore now the Ministers of Christ by Duty, and are bound to study his Interest and Laws, and to obey him.

VIII. Subjects by Obligation are not always Subjects by Consent. nor Subjects by Professed Consent, always Subjects by Heart-Consent.

IX. All the World is the Kingdom as of God the Creator, so of Christ the Redeemer as to Obligation: And the Wicked as Rebels.

X. All the truly Baptized are thereby made the Kingdom of Christ the Redeemer by *Professed Consent*. And this is the Church visible.

XI. All the true Believers and Sanctified are the Kingdom of Christ by Heart-Consent; and these are the Church Regenerate and Mystical.

XII. Therefore the Kingdom of Christ is larger than the Church of Christ: And the Church is an Elect peculiar people, Visible as to Means, and Mystical as to Salvation. Even as the Israelites had the Covenant of peculiarity, while the Law of Grace in the first Edition made to Adam and Noah was still in force to all the World: And Abraham thought that even Sodom had had Fifty Righteous Persons in it.

XIII. The Church of Christ is an Eminent Politick Society, of which Christ is the *Specifying* and *Unifying* Head, and all Christians are Members. All the Baptized Visible Members, and all the sincere consenters mystical Members.

XIV. Christ is the Maker of his own Body, Church or Kingdom: He made himself the Head: He

He made the specifying Institution or Law; the Terms of Union and Communion; He giveth Men the Grace by which they Believe, Repent, Consent and are made Members.

If Christ made not his own Church, as to the Formal Head, the Species, the Unifying Terms and Graces, it would be as a Wooden Leg to a living Body, a Human Creature imposed on him, Savouring of the Errours and Naughtiness of those that made it, and Mutable at their Mutable Wills. Every active Form, makes it's own material *Domicilium*. Who is he, or who are they that had power to make Christ a Body or Church *in specie*, before he made it himself: Christs Body is not made by Man? If it were, who were they? Were they his Body or Church first themselves, or not? If yea, who made them such, and who them, and who them *in infinitum*: If not, how came Infidels and the Members of the Devil to have power to make a Body or Church for Christ?

XV. Christ hath *de specie* Instituted who shall be Members of this Church: And by his Laws, Terms and Description taught us certainly to know the Members as Visible.

Else we could never know whom to take for Christians, nor whom to love as such; Nor to whom to give the Seals of his Grace, and Communion with his Members.

XVI. Baptism is the Symbol or Badge of Christians, and Baptizing is our Christening; and whoever believeth and is Baptized, shall be Saved: Therefore till they Revolt, all truly Baptized persons are Visible Christians, and make up the Visible Church: Which is the Society of all Chri-

Christians, Headed by their Sovereign Christ.

XVII. All Christians entered in Infancy, are not capable of the Duty, Blessings and Communion of the Adult. Adult Members and Communion must be distinguished from Infant.

XVIII. Therefore all that will have Adult Communion, though they must not be Baptized again, must as fully own their Baptifmal Covenant, Devoting themselves by their own *Understanding Consent* and *Vow* to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Renouncing the World, the Flesh and the Devil, as if they were now to be Baptized.

The neglect of this, or turning it into a dead image and Ceremony, by dead Images of Bishops, on pretence of Confirmation, confoundeth the Church, and would make it a dead Image, and really but the World.

XIX. The Universal Church of Christ in his days on Earth, was but an Embrio; and his few Apostles and Disciples, who were suited in number to the Jewish Nation, where their Ministry was to begin, were but like the Organical parts of the Body, the Heart, Head, Eyes, Liver, &c. when Nature hath first made them, that by them it may make the rest. But when Christ was Risen, and the Holy Ghost sent down in Eminency, and the Gentiles called, and the Church began to be Catholick, this Kingdom of the Holy Ghost is that which is called specially, the Kingdom of God and Heaven, which the Gospel then proclaimed, and *John Baptist* told Men was at hand.

XX. The Church of Christ on Earth is partly Visible and partly Invisible, and yet but one Church.

As Man is visible as to his Body, and invisible as to his Soul, and yet but one Man. It is visible, 1. In that the Subjects persons are Visible; 2. Their profession is Visible: 3. Christ was Visible on Earth: 4. He is Visible now in his Court of Heaven: 5. He will in visible Glory come and Judge them. 6. They shall see His Glory for ever: 7. His Laws are Visible: 8. His Officers are Visible. 9. Many of his Judgments and Executions are Visible here: 10. The rest shall be so quickly, and for ever.

His Church is Invisible, 1. In that Christ as God was never seen: 2. His Soul never seen: 3. His Office as to *Truth, Right and Authority* Invisible, and to be believed. 4. The Souls of the Subjects Invisible; 5. Their Sincerity Invisible. 6. And Christ now not seen on Earth. 7. Nor Heaven and Hell seen, where is his great Execution and Retribution.

XXI. Christ only is the Specifying and Unifying *Form* of the Church, as United to the Matter: And all Christians, Pastors and People, are but the Matter.

They have a sort of Unity in themselves: They are of one Human kind, of one Interest, of one Profession (and Faith and Love if sincere) and joyn in one sort of Worship, and Acts of Obedience to Christ; But they are *One Christian Church*, or *Body of Christ*, only by their *Union with Christ*, and *Relation to him* their Head and Center. As the Kingdom of *England* hath one sort of Men in our Land, of one Language, &c. But only their Relation to one King, makes them one Kingdom.

XXII. The Church or Body of Christ when fully

folly made, hath dissimilar parts; some are Noble *Organical* parts, first made to be instruments in making and preserving all the rest; and the Church cannot be a Formed Church without them; some are such *Integrals*, as the Church may live without, but not be *Whole* without.

Even as *Aristotle* defineth the Soul to be *Entelechia*, or the *Entitative Act and Form of a Physical organized Body*, capable of being *Animated* by it. And as in Generation the Heart is first made, and then some Rudiments of the Vessels for Distribution, and then the Head and Eyes, and then the Liver, &c. So Christs Humane Nature with his Spirit, is as Heart and Head to the Church: And then Teaching by himself first, was as the Arteries for Distribution; And the Apostles were first made the most Noble *Organical* parts, to Deliver and Record his Universal Commands, and by his Spirit, make up the Inferior parts; and the ordinary Pastors to be as the Stomach and Liver, &c. for the Nutrition of the whole. None of these parts are the Soul or *forma hominis*; but the Noblest parts are necessary in that Contexture, which is *forma Corporis*, to make it *materia disposita*, receptive of the Soul, which is the Form, as to its full Operation, though the *Semen* to make an *Embrio* before received it. Much like is it in our present Case.

XXIII. Our Controversie then is not, whether it be necessary to the being of the Church in *facto esse*, that it have Apostles and Pastors and Teachers, to make it the *Organized Body* of Christ, for this we all acknowledge. Nor yet whether these should be all Christians of one Body, Spirit, Faith, Baptism, Hope, united to one Head
and

and *God* in him ; Nor whether the *Unity* of the Spirit (for that's the *Unity*) should be kept in the *Bond of Peace* , no more than whether the dissimilar parts of the *Body* should all be of one *Matter* , and live by one nutriment , united to the same *Head and Heart* , *Contiguous* , and made for the *Good* of the whole , actuated by the same *Spirits* , and *Animated* by the same *Soul* .

XXIV. *But our Controversie with the Papists is, Whether the Church on Earth have any One lawful Supream Power under Christ , Monarchical , Aristocratical or Democratical , authorized to Govern the whole by Legislation and Judgment : That is , One Ministerial Sovereign , or Vice-Christ ; a Constitutive , specifying and Unifying Supream over all , being one Political person , whether in one , or many natural Persons ? This Protestants deny.*

XXV. It is but our second Question with the Papists, *Whether the Pope be this Head or Supreme Rector : but our first and fundamental Controversie is, Whether there be any such at all but Christ.*

Did we believe there were any such at all , we should readily be Papists , either of those that give most to the Pope as *Absolute* , or of those that make him the *President of Councils* , and in their *Intervals* , the *Prime Church Governor* according to the *Laws* . Of which more anon.

That the Protestants commonly deny all *Universal Sovereignty* but *Christ's* , I should tire the Reader needlessly to prove by numerous Citations. He may soon know that will read, 1. All the Churches *Confessions* in the *Corpus Confessionum* . 2. Our *Oaths* for renouncing all foreign *Jurisdications* . 3. Our *Disputants* , *Luther* , (*de Conciliis*) *Zuinglius* , *Oecolampadius* , *Melanchthon* , *Brentius* , *Calvin* ,

Calvin, Bullinger, Zanchy, Iliricus, Pezelius, Musculus, Arctius, Chamier, Molinaus, Blondel, Dallaus, River, Paraus, Sohnius, Piscator, Beza, Sadeel, Dannus, Grynæus, Spanhemius, Arminius, Episcopus, &c. Jewel, Whitaker, Reignolds, Crakenthorpe, Abbot, Challoner, Willet, Usher, White, Chillingworth, Davenant, Morton, Carlton, Bernard, Barrow, &c. Their Disputes were not *Who is this Summa-Potestas Ministerial to Govern all the Christian World*, but *whether there be any such?*

XXVI. No Protestants ever yet denied the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basil, and the French allowed Clergy to be Papists because they were not of the Italian strain, nor for the absolute unlimited Power of the Pope. Nor did any call them Protestants.

XXVII. That the Pope hath no right to an Universal Supremacy, Headship or Government, I have proved at large in the First and Second Part of my Key for Catholicks: And Dr. Barrow hath better and more largely proved after many other. Briefly,

1. No Man is naturally capable of Governing all the World. Only God and our Redeemer is capable; Man cannot know, hear, send, execute over all the Earth *per se & per alios*, it's a kind of madness to imagine it.

2. The Christian Churches are mostly under the Power of various Princes, Abassines, Turks, Persians, the Mogol, Moscovites, Tartarians, Swedes, Danes, English, &c. that will not receive the Pope: How then can he govern the Subjects under them?

3. Had such a Head been of Christ's making, he would have plainly made us understand it by his

his word : Of so great importance would it be to the Churches Unity and our Salvation.

4. When Heresies and Sects and Controversies arose and troubled the Church, the Apostles would sure have told them this necessary means of ending all, and living in Unity and Concord.

5. *Paul* would never have chidden the Contenders for saying, *I am of Cephas*, if centering in him had been the only uniting means.

6. *Peter* never exercised any Power over the rest of the Apostles, nor over the Universal Church any more than the rest.

7. If he had, it had been no more to the Bishop of *Rome*, than to the Bishop of *Antioch*, and others.

8. None can shew any Commission of Christ for such a Headship : And none other can authorize them.

9. The Council of *Chalcedon* saith expressly, that it's *being the Imperial Seat*, caused *Rome* to have the Primacy by the Father's Gift.

10. The whole Greek Church never believed that Christ made any Universal Sovereign : For, 1. Else they would never have contended for the Primacy at *Constantinople* (nor for the second place) : For they knew that was no Apostolical Seat, nor did they claim it as by Christ's institution : and they were not so impudent as to set up a Human Right before a Divine. 2. And even they never claimed a Sovereignty over the *Extra Imperial Christian World*, but only over the Churches of the Empire, and those that had been the Emperor's Subjects.

11. The Fathers and Primitive Church, and Tradition are all against the Pope's Universal Government without the Empire (as I have elsewhere proved).

12. The

12. The Catholick Church is now against such a Sovereign, even the far greatest part of Christians: And it never acknowledged him or united in him in any Age.

13. There is less reason for one Church Monarch over all the World than for one Civil Monarch (as shall be further proved) which yet no Man hath the face to plead for.

14. This Papal Claim hath no just pretence; There is no work or use for any such Power (of which more anon). Let not Magistrates or Pastors be robbed of their right, and there will no Governing Work be left for the Pope.

15. It is an unsufferable Usurpation of the Power of all Christian Princes, who are entrusted with the Exteriors and Accidentals of the Church; and a wrong to them, and their Kingdoms to subject them to Foreigners. The Pope of old was a Subject to one Prince; And for one Princes Subject to Rule all other Princes of the Earth, is in effect to make that Prince the Ruler of them all.

16. A humane Usurping Head maketh an humane adulterous Catholick Church; and makes that the Body of the Pope, which should be but the Body of Christ.

17. It is a certain means of Schism, while thereby they separate that humane Society of the Usurper from all the Church that will own no Head but Christ.

18. This Idol Head or Vice-Christ in plain Pride setting up himself as the Governour of the World, and setting the World together by the Ears about his Title, by Usurping the Government over them, must needs make it a hard question at least to Christians, whether this Idol be not the Anti-christ,

christ, that is, the *Pro-Christ*, while he makes himself the Vice-Christ. And especially when it's considered what men abundance of the Popes have been, and how much they have done against the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and faithful Servants of Christ.

19. They have no way to give the World any satisfactory certainty who is Pope, and who not: How then can the World be ruled by him?

1. They cannot tell whether the Electors or Consecrators be they that necessarily give him his Power, or make him Pope. 2. If it be the *Electors*, they cannot tell us who those must be. If any will serve, the Turk may make a Pope! And then ten sort of Electors may make ten Popes: If it be tied to any one sort of Men, the Papacy hath long been extinct; for in some Ages the People of *Rome* chose with the City Clergy: In some Ages the Neighbour Bishops and People chose: In some the Emperors: In some Cardinals; And sometimes General Councils: If God had appointed one *Unifying Head* to his Church, he would have determined who should choose him, and told us how to know him.

If it be Consecration that maketh him Pope, God would have authorized some to Consecrate him. If any will serve, some may Consecrate one, and some another, and some a third: Every one may have three Bishops. If it must be both a just Election and Consecration the uncertainty will be the greater, when neither of them is certain.

And none can give Power but they that have it to give. But Electors and Consecrators being Inferiors have none to give. If

If they say that God only giveth the Power, and the Electors do but choose the Receiver, and the Consecrators invest him: I answer, It is so indeed in the true Coliation of Church-offices, and Power (Whether Mr. *Dodwell* and such others will or not). But that's here all one as to our uncertainty *Who is the Man*.

2. And this is no feigned case: when in such a multitude of Schisms, there have been two or three Popes at once (and once six alive at once that were or had been Popes): And these made Bishops and Cardinals, and those Bishops made Priests, and no man yet knows which of them (if either) had the right.

3. And is it the *Name* of a *Roman* Bishop, or the *Thing* that is necessary to the being of an Universal Pastor? If the *Name*, a Hundred may be so called; And bare Names give not so great Power: If the *Thing*, how were those Bishops of *Rome*, that divers Score Years did dwell in *France*, and never did any Bishop's Work at *Rome*, nor had *Rome's* Consent? Might not one in *Armenia* have been as truly called the Bishop of *Rome*?

But if it be *Possession* that gives validity to the claim, then the strongest hath the best title. And they that have by turns driven out each other were all true Popes: And who was Possessor, when one was at *Rome*, and another (that carried it at last) at *Avignon* or in *Germany*?

20. Tying an Unifying Head of all the Church on Earth to *Rome*; doth leave it in the Power of any Infidel, or Arian that can get *Rome* to set a Head of the Christian Religion on the Church; that is, To un-church it, destroy it or corrupt it. For all that know the World, know how ordinarily

rily the Present Powers can prevail with their Subjects to Elect whom they please ; As *Theodoricus* and other Arians at *Rome* have done. And if the Turk should conquer *Rome*, how easily could he keep them from having any Bishop at all, and so the Church were dead as headless.

21. Yea *Rome* hath long been without any true Bishop : And the Church is no Church without it's Constitutive Head. In divers times of Wars, Desolations, and Persecutions, yea, long by the Disagreement of the Electors, and many ages by the nullity of uncapable Popes, some set up by Whores, and Tyrants, and some deposed by General Councils as Hereticks, and yet continuing (as *Eugen. 4.*) And long much of *Italy* it self deposed the Roman Bishop, and set up a Patriarch at *Aquileia*, and took him for their Head.

22. Yea, it is certain by their Doctrine of necessary uninterrupted Succession, that there is now no Pope nor ever can be. For when so many false Elections, Incapacities by Simony, Heresie, Schism, Infidelity, Councils Depositions, have interrupted the Succession, it can never (by their way) be restored.

23. By all the Canons every City should choose their own Bishop : And so *Rome* (oft a Nest of Wickedness) would be made the Mistriss or Head of all the World ; when as Cosmography is not so necessary to Christianity, that all the World should be bound ever to know that there is such a place as *Rome* in the World : And it were a strange thing that God should make it necessary to Salvation for them at the Antipodes and all the Earth, to obey one City, and him that they elect. Was it ignorance or craft in Pope *Zachary* to Ex-

commu-

communicate one for saying there were Antipodes. If he knew of no Men on the other side of the Earth, he was unlike to Govern them. If he perswaded Men that one half of the Earth was uninhabited, that he might not be known to be no Governor of them, it was vain Craft. But it's liker it was Ignorance.

He that would have more Proof, may find enough in *Dr. Barrow*.

XXVIII. The Pope by this Claim of Universal Government claimeth so much Power unjustly from and over all Princes on Earth, as obligeth them all to take him for a Publick Enemy, as one would do that should claim an Universal Monarchy, and tell them on pain of Deposition they must be all his Subjects: as the Pope doth on pain of Excommunication, Deposition and Damnation.

None ever had the madness to dream of an Universal Schoolmaster, or Physicion. *Gregory* long ago made the claim of Universal Bishop to be a mark of Antichrist.

XXIX. Christ bindeth all Christians to live in Communion as Saints, as making up one Body Politick (of a transcendent Species) of which Christ is the Supreme Governor or Head.

This therefore is none of the Controversie between us: All Christians are agreed that as many Members of different shape, use and honour make up one Natural Body, so do Christians that differ in Gifts, Office and Grace make up one Body of Christ. And as every Member contributeth to the good of the whole Body, so must every Christian to the good of the Universal Church: And so it is not only Bishops that have every one a Charge in his Place to promote the Universal

welfare, but every Presbyter, and every Christian in his Place. Therefore that Bishops are related to the whole Church, no more proveth that they have as a Senate a *summa potestas* or any Universal Government over it, as one College, than it will prove it in all other Christians, who are all related to the whole; Nor no more than the Members of the Body do make one natural Governing Part by Consent.

XXX. This Communion of Christians in the Church as Catholick; is essentiated by the Essentials of Christianity and Ministry; for Christians as Christians with Christ the Head do constitute the Catholick Church, in its first being as *in fieri*, And Christians as Christian Ministers of Christ, and private Disciples, do constitute the organized Body which with Christ the Head make an organized Catholick Church.

XXXI. The Integrals of Christianity & Communion are not necessary to the Essence of the Church, but to the Integrity: Much less the Accidents.

XXXII. The Christian Churches through the World have Communion in all these things following at this day. 1. They are all Baptized with the same Baptism in Essence; and so are all Christians. Particularly they all profess to believe in God the Father, one Jesus Christ our Redeemer, and one Holy Ghost, one in Essence with the Father and the Son. They all profess the same Creed called the Apostles, yea and the *Nicene*: and the Lord's Prayer as the Rule of our Desires, and the Decalogue as a summary Rule of Practice: They all believe the same holy Canonical Scripture, as to as many Books at least as are necessary to the being of Christianity and Salvation. They all
ture,

agree in the Essentials of the Sacred Ministry, that such must teach the Infidels of the World, and make them Disciples of Christ baptizing them; and then must teach them Christ's Commands: That they are under Christ's Teaching, Priestly and Kingly office, to be to the Churches the Peoples Teachers, their Guides in Publick Worship, and the Rulers of their Communion by the Power of the Keys. They agree in the Essentials of the Lord's Supper, save that the Papists have corrupted it by Transubstantiation, and other foul Abuses. The Protestants, Greeks, Armenians, Abassines and all or near all the Parties of Christians in the World are agreed in all this and much more, excepting the said Corruptions of Popery. 2. Their Religion teacheth them all to Love one another, as the Members of the same Body of Christ; to do good to all, especially to the Household of Faith; and to Pray for one another, and and relieve each other in want, and to do to all as they would have others do to them. In a word to Love God as God, and Saints as Saints, and Men as Men, and all to seek one Heavenly Kingdom, and all fight against the same Enemies, the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. And this is Catholick Communion.

XXXIII. The greater Communion they have in all the Integral parts of Christian Faith, Worship and Government, the more strong and amiable the several Churches are, and so is the whole by such Communion: But it is not necessary to the Essence.

It is not the Papists trick of challenging us to name Fundamentals that will cheat men of understanding to confound Essentials and Integrals: That
C c 2 which

which hath no Essence is nothing: that whose Essentials are unknown is not knowable, nor can be defined. Christianity was once known by Baptism: and it was once knowable who were to be Baptized, and who to be received as Christians into Communion. There are multitudes of Divine Truths revealed in Scripture, and therefore to be believed, which are not essential to a Christian or a Church: And so there are Integral Parts of Worship and Discipline. He that needs more proof of this, is not one of those that I write for.

XXXIV. The Accidents of Christianity and Churches are of two sorts: some such as it is desirable that all Churches should agree in, though it be necessary neither to their Essence or Integrity. And some such in which an Universal Agreement is neither possible nor desirable.

As it is desirable to comeliness that all men have Hair and Nails, &c. but not that they all wear Cloaths of the same Stuff, Shape, or Price; or all dwell in Houses of the same materials, form or bigness, nor all use the same Trade of Life, nor be of one Age or Rank, &c. It is desirable that all the World spake one Language, and were of one Judgment in all things of common concernment: But it's hopeless, And he would play the hypocritical Devil, that on pretence of seeking Unity, would destroy or ruin all that agree not in these things; so is it as to Church Communion: It is desirable that all Christians understood and spake one Language; and that we had but one perfect sort of Copy of the Bible without various readings; or where Translations are necessary that they were all perfect and agreeable; but it's hopeless: As the case is, it is not desirable, much less necessary,

necessary, that we all Worship God in one Language when all understand it not, or that we all use the same Translations, Liturgy, or words of Prayer or Preaching, or all wear the same sort of Garments, and an hundred such *like* : And to silence all that do not, or reject them from Catholick Communion is the like hypocritical Diabolism; and in that way, the Devil and the Pope are the greatest *Uniters*, that is, Dividers and Destroyers in the World.

XXXV. *The Universal Church containeth many particular Churches throughout the World.*

This none denieth. As a Kingdom hath many Cities and Corporations.

XXXVI. These particular Churches Parts of the Universal, have a distinct constitutive Form: That is, Christ only is Sovereign of the Universal, but his Officers are the particular constitutive ruling part of the particular; though under Christ.

King and Subjects only are Essential to a Kingdom; But a Mayor, Bailiff, or other chief Officer, and the common Citizens are Essential to a City. And to call a man Chief or Head of a Family or City, that is no King, is no Treason, but to claim the Royalty is:

XXXVII. Therefore there is more necessary to Communion in a particular Church as a Member of it, than to Catholick Communion. *Viz.*

He must consent to his Relation and Submission to the particular Pastors of that Church; and to meet at the same time and place, and joyn in all the necessary Parts of Publick Worship with them: Else local Communion will be impossible.

Therefore it is injurious ignorance which maintaineth of late, that he that separateth from or is

justly cast out of one Church, separateth from, or is cast out of all. For he that will not own the Pastor of that Church, cannot have Communion with it as a Member of that Church; who can come to School to a Schoolmaster that he consents not to? And yet he may own most or all other Pastors of the Catholick Church as such. He that thinks the Subscriptions, Forms or Ceremonies of the Greek, Roman or English Church unlawful, doth not therefore think Christianity or Catholick Communion unlawful.

XXXVIII. All Christians are not bound to be fixed Members of particular Churches subordinate to National; but those that can enjoy it ought.

The Negative I have so fully proved against Dr. *Stillingfleet*, that for Dr. *Sherlock* to go on to harp on the same string, and give no answer to it, doth but tell us with what Men we have to do. I will not repeat the Proofs I gave, that some Ambassadors, some Merchants, some wandering Beggars or Traders, some Travellers, and some where no Churches yet are gathered, some Soldiers, and some in times of Confusion, are not obliged to be fixed Members of any particular Church; but only to be Christians in Communion with the Church Catholick, and to hold transient Communion with the Churches where they come. He that yet will deny this, words will not make him see it.

XXXIX. Many of these Churches in one Kingdom, have so great advantage by the Unity of Sovereignty, civil Interest and Laws, to be strengthening helpers to one another, that they should accordingly associate, and live in as much concord as their various conditions, Auditors and Imperfections will allow.

And

And accordingly as Neighbours owe some more Charity to each other than to Strangers, so Christians under the same Prince united by Civil Government, Laws and Interest, should be so far from persecuting and destroying each other, for that which in various Kingdoms is allowable in Religion, that they should exercise more love, compassion and forbearance of one another.

XL. Christian Princes are true Parts of the Kingdom of Christ, and eminent Integral Parts of the Universal Church, as well as Pastors. And are bound by Christ to do their best to make all their Kingdoms, the Kingdoms of Christ; that is, to bring all their Subjects to consent to be Christians, and to live in concordant Obedience to the Laws of Christ.

And so all Nations should be disciplined as far as they can procure it: And such National Churches, that is, Christian Kingdoms, we must all desire.

XLI. Supreme Christian Princes or States are authorized and obliged to drive on, by just means, all Pastors and People to the Duties of their several Places, and correct them for their Crimes.

XLII. Christian Princes and States being Members of the Universal Church, are bound to contribute their best endeavours to its welfare: And therefore so far to Unite and Agree as is necessary to their mutual strengthening for the Universal good.

XLIII. Therefore so far as Civil Councils, or Dyets of many Princes or their Delegates or Ambassadors are necessary to this Concord for the common good, they are bound by God to keep such. And where Meetings cannot be kept, to use all meet correspondency by Ambassadors and Letters for the same End.

So that this is no duty proper to Bishops, but common to Christian Princes: And if their sinful omission make it strange, it is nevertheless their duty, as God will make them know.

XLIV. Thy Synods of Pastors duly ordered are of great use for their mutual advice, strength and concord, in order to the universal good.

So far are we from being against them, that we think the right use of them of great importance. That they may keep a right understanding of the Faith which they agree in, and bear down Heresies the better by their joynt opposition; and may keep up Christian Love, and work out the disaffections which strangers and the calumnies of backbiters are apt to breed. And even in Integrals and meet Accidents may do as much in Concord as they can.

XLV. The Obligation which lieth on Particular Pastors to observe the Agreements of such Synods, is from the general command of Love and Concord; and the means thereto. And he that stands not to such Agreements as make for the Strength and Concord of the Churches, violateth this Common Law. But such Agreements of Synods as make not for this common end, but are against it, no man is obliged to observe.

For it is no means that is not for the End, but against it. Therefore every Canon which enjoyneth sin, or is not to the Churches good but hurt, must not be kept.

XLVI. It is not true that the Diocesan is by Office the Representer of the whole Church in Synods, and Presbyters have no place or decisive Votes.

Protestants have at large confuted this in their
Confu-

Confutations of Popery; and so have many French Papists, and some others. The Convocation in *England* hath a lower House of Presbyters: Else in *Abassia* one Bishop were instead of all the Clergy of the Empire: And two or three were a National Synod, in a Nation that hath no more Diocesses. They can shew no Commission for such a Representative Power; therefore they have none such.

XLVII. Much less have five Patriarchs, and a few Metropolitans, or such near them as they will call Authority to pass for the Representatives of all the Christian World, and to constitute a General Council.

XLVIII. No Pastors or Churches can give power to any to represent them absolutely; but only limitedly to lawful things, for common good: And to oblige them no further or longer to stand to what they do, than the common good requirerh it.

What a man may not do himself, he may not authorize another to do for him: And no man may himself oppose Truth or Duty, or cross the common good, or assert any falshood, or consent to any sin. And that which accidentally maketh for the common good in one Age or Countrey, may be against it in the next: And then we are obliged against it, whatever our Delegates, Ancestors or selves did for it before.

XLIX. There was never in the World a General Council of all the Bishops on Earth, nor of the Representatives of all the Churches: Even the six or eight, or more old Councils now most honoured, were General but as to One *Empire*, (yea far from that,) and not as to all the Christian World.

This

This I have fully proved in my second Book against *Johnson*; 1. From the Subscriptions to the said Councils; 2. From the Authority of the Emperors that called them; 3. From the rest of the History and Acts; 4. And from the Testimony of the Historians of those Times. Yet *A. Bishop Bromhall*, with the Papist Priest *Johnson* maintaineth the contrary, pag. 110. saying, [*This Exception was made in the dark, &c.* and saith, it abounds with Errors; and that the *Abuna of Ethiopia* submitteth to the Patriarch of Alexandria, and they all acknowledge the Pope the first Patriarch, &c.

Ans. 1. If such a cant as this go with any man for a satisfactory answer to the full proof aforesaid which I have given, and my Confutation of ten times more of *Johnsons*, I have done with that man.

Ans. 2. Our Question is, Whether any, or all the *Extra-Imperial Churches* had Bishops in those Councils, or were there represented, yea or ever called? Doth he prove a word of this? Not one word; but saith, The *Ethiopians* now submit to them.

Ans. 3. The Question is not, what they do now, but what they did then. Christian Reader, admire the gracious Providence of God. The Custom then was for the *Major Vote* of the Bishops in Council, when they anathematized any as Hereticks, to get them banished. Many of these banished men enlarged the Church, and increased the numbers of Christians where they came; but they propagated a Condemnation of the Councils that condemned them. *Nestorius*, but specially *Dioseorus* and *Jacobus Syrus*, and many

ny of the *Eutychians* turned multitudes in the East and South, and some in *Tartary* to their minds herein. Among others the *Abyssines* were taken with the Reverence and Authority of *Dioscorus*, condemning the Council at *Chalcedon*, and the rest that were against him. And all the *Extra-Imperial Churches* honoured those of the Empire above themselves, living under Infidels (except *Abassia*) and rejoiced in the Power of the Christian Empire; but never joyned in their Councils, nor received them as their Laws, but rejoiced as Consenters to all that they thought good. He cannot prove that before *Dioscorus* Banishment the *Abassines* obeyed *Alexandria*: And to this day, their *Abuna* is chosen by the Monks at *Jerusalem*, say some, but say others, chosen and confirmed by the titular Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and ruleth *Abassia* himself; and they all condemn the foresaid Councils, and the Pope. *Godignus* tells you and *Ludolphus* more fully, what respect they have for the Pope and our Councils.

Ans. 4. The truth is, all that ever I heard yet that can be said for the Subjection of the *Abassines*, or other Exterior Churches to the Council even of *Nice*, or the Patriarchs before, is but a Word in the Canons lately Divulged by *Pisanus*; which are novel, of no Authority, nor to be Credited by any that Credit not the Roman Forgeries: And it's contrary to the true Nicene Canon, that saith *Egypt only is Subject to Alexandria*, when this Forgery addeth *Ethiopia*: And yet it's said of *Trajan*, that he went far into *Ethiopia* to Enlarge the *Roman Power*: So if the *Romans* had any skirt there, as they had oft in *Persia* and *Seythia*, that's nothing to the *Abassines*, nor pro-
veth

veth any Exteriors, much less all represented in the General Councils of old.

Ans. 5. Many Countries and Parties did for Concord, and some Advantages, put themselves under particular Patriarchs, and also profess their voluntary consent to the Nicene, and some other Councils, Canons or Creed. who yet never took a General Council for the Rightful Sovereign of the Christian Churches, through the World. At this day one Sect obeyeth only the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and rejecteth all the rest; and another the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and three others, the three pretending Patriarchs of *Antioch*, rejecting the rest: and they reject as aforesaid some of the four first Councils, and all that followed: By which it appeareth, that they take not the four or five Patriarchs Essential to Catholick Unity, nor General Councils to have a supream Regiment over all. Most Protestants receive the four first General Councils (saving some mutable accidentals:) And yet they hold not their Universal Sovereignty.

L. It is neither lawful nor possible to call a Universal Council to Exercise Universal Sovereignty, nor ever like to be.

I have fully proved this in the Second part of my Key for Catholicks: Consider, 1. It must be Grave Experienced Men, who are fit to be trusted in so great a Matter: And such are Aged and usually weak.

2. From *Abassia*, *Mexico*, *Armenia*, &c. they must be a year or near in receiving the Summons. and as long in preparing and coming to *Europe*, if this be the place.

3. They must it's like, be some years absent at the Council.

4 They

4. They cannot (if they are sufficient Representatives) come all into one Room to hear Debates.

5. They cannot most of them understand one anothers Language.

6. They will hardly live to bring back the Decrees.

7. There is no Person or Senate in the World, that hath an obliging Authority to call them.

8. It is not like that they will ever agree Voluntarily to meet in one place, without such Authority: The *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Syrians*, &c. will think we should come to them, and we shall think they should come to us.

9. If possibly they should agree, a Mans Age is little enough to go all over the World to Solicite and bring them to such Agreement.

10. Who, and how many will undertake that task?

11. How few can bear the Charges of all this.

12. It were sinful Cruelty to Separate the Wiſest Men ſo long from their Charges, to the Peoples loſs, as well as by the Voyages and Journeys to kill them.

13. It is certain, that moſt of the Princes on Earth, under whoſe power the Biſhops live, would not give leave to go out of their Dominions to ſuch Synods; moſt being Infidels, many Heterodox, and many in Wars or Enmity with each other, and almoſt all in Jealouſies; and without their leave, they cannot come.

14. The great Numbers of the nearer Biſhops, and the paucity of the moſt remote, would make it no true Representative, as to Votes.

15. There

15. There is no one on Earth Antecedently Authorized to be their President (what ever the Papists pretend:) And to choose a President, it's like so many such would hardly agree.*

16. It's already known, that they account one another Hereticks, or Schismaticks, or Usurping Tyrants before hand: Some are called Nestorian Hereticks, some Eutychian or Jacobite Hereticks, some Melchites, some one thing, and some another, and most take the Papists for Tyrants, and Hereticks both. And will all these ever meet in Council?

17. Men are naturally so much for their own ease, and so much against Works of so vast difficulty, charge and hazard, that a competent number of fit Men would never undertake it; it being almost equal to a Martyrdom, which even the best Men will not undergo, till they are better Convinced of the Duty and Necessity than any Man can truly be of such Universal Councils.

18. It's known that all the Protestants, if not almost all other Christians, save Papists, do believe no such Councils to be necessary, no, nor lawful, but to be usurping Tyranny, as challenging the Universal Church-Government as a Senate.

So that as there never was, so there never will be, must be, or can be such a Council; unless (which God forbid) all the Church should be again Reduced to a narrow Room.

LI. They that would make such Councils, possible by pretending that a few Patriarchs and such Bishops as they will bring with them, are the

the Sufficient and Authorized Representers of all the rest, do but more grossly deceive and abuse the Christian World.

For, 1. They never proved, nor can prove that ever Christ Authorized such Patriarchs, much less to such a Power.

2. And whereas Arch-Bishop Bromhal saith, that *God doth it by the Law of Nature, enabling Men to do it*, and to deny this is to overthrow all Government: I answer, 1. We know of no such Law of Nature; nor that he is a Credible Expofitor of it: We take the Law of Nature (on the Reasons before and after mentioned) to be plainly against the very being of such Councils, and especially against such trusting our Religion with them, and supposing them to be the Governors of all the Christian Princes and People on Earth.

2. What Men be they that have given these Patriarchs this Power? If Men dead 1300. years ago, they have no Authority now: Dead Men have no ruling Power. The Laws of the Land bind us not now by any power, that the Dead Kings and Parliaments have over us: But (though made by them) they bind us now only as the Laws of our present Governours. By the Constitution, the Successive Kings are still by consent to make them *Their Laws*, till by consent of King and Parliament, they are Dissolved: Unless some present power over us make them *Their Laws*, no old Church Canons can bind us. 3. If they say that God binds us to stand to what our Ancestors did, I want the proof of that: If we will have the benefit of our Ancestors Contract, we must stand to them, else we may choose: A Father cannot bind his Child to his hurt, but only to his

his Benefit. Let them prove the Obligation.

4. But we deny that any made those Patriarchs, who would have had any power over us, had we been then alive. The Subjects of one Prince made them in his Empire, and he Confirmed them. But neither that Prince nor his Subjects were our Rulers here, what if the King or Convocation make *Canterbury* and *York* Metropolitans: Doth it follow that they have Church-power over other Lands.

5. These Patriarchs had never the Government of any given them by the old Councils, but within the Empire: And after of some Volunteers that for Advantage chose it.

6. Who be these Patriarchs they talk of? Are they not all turned into Names and Shadows, Condemning one another? and must these five fighting Shadows Represent and Rule the Christian World?

7. To return to the twelve Apostles is Impertinent: The Apostles were prime Ministers, and more Represented Christ than the Church. The Church chose them not: Christ made them Foundations, Bases and Pillars in his Church, but not Representatives of it. And if he had, they chose none to Succeed them as Apostles: But as ordinary Ministers, all Ministers Succeed them, and as Superior Ministers, some say Bishops. *Bellarmino* confesseth and proveth, that the Apostles as such have no Successors, and that the Pope Succeedeth not *Peter* as an Apostle, but (as he Dreams) as an ordinary Supream Pastor. Had the Apostles settled twelve or thirteen Successors, or appointed any Churches to be Rulers of the rest, we must have obeyed these Rulers: But

But who have called them a General Council? None but *Rome*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria* claimed Succession from the Apostles; and all these claimed it but from one Apostle *Peter*, *Rome* and *Antioch* as his pretended Seats, and *Alexandria* that he set *St. Mark* over them, sure the Apostles rose not from the dead to make *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* Patriarchates: And if they had, four of the five Patriarchs are all now Subjects to the Turk: And experience telling us what Power Princes have in the Choice and Ruling of the Clergy: All this doth but say, that the Turk is the Chief Governour of the Religion and Consciences of all the Christian World.

If they plead for new Power to make Patriarchs, let them prove who hath that Power over all the World, and how they came by it, and how they now use it. Will all the Christian World who fear the guilt of obeying Usurpers, and disobeying Christians, ever unite in the obedience of Patriarchs, who cannot be known by the wisest, much less by all to have any Authority to command them?

LII. The Pope hath done much of his mischiefs to the Church and World by the Councils of Bishops.

They have been his Army, and he their General: Without them he could have done little or nothing: By them the most of Church Corruptions have been made Laws: By them Emperors have been deposed, Rebellions maintained, the Pope enabled to give away their Kingdoms, absolve Subjects from their Oaths, to make it a Heresie (called *Henrician*) to be Loyal, to dig dead Bishops out of their graves as Hereticks, that

that were for Loyalty : Yea the Councils of Bishops without, if not against the Pope, deposed the good *Ludovicus Pius*, and have done much to the corruption and confusion of the Churches ; as I have elsewhere proved.

LIII. General Councils are not the authorized or lawful Supreme Government of the Universal Church, nor have an Universal Legislative or Judiciary Power.

This many Protestants, and after all Dr. *Barrow* have unanswerably proved.

Arg. 1. If there never was, nor must be, nor can be a true Universal Council, then such a Council is not the Churches Supreme Government. But the antecedent I have before proved.

Arg. 2. That Government which the Church was without for three hundred years, is not the just Supreme Government of the Universal Church : (For the Church is not the Church without its Supreme Government.) But the Church was without a General Council at least for three hundred years.

Arg. 3. That Government which rarely existeth, and hath not existed near an hundred years, or, as some of our Adversaries say, a thousand, is not the Supreme Government of the Church : (For then the Church would be dead, and no Church in all that time of vacancy ; for the Species depends on the Supreme Government.) But the Church hath so rarely had that which our present Adversaries themselves take for a true General Council. If the Council of *Trent* were any, they have had none since. Yea Bishop *Gunning* owneth but the six first Councils called General : And if there were none since, then the Church

Church hath had no Supreme Council just a thousand years : And was it this thousand years no Church? or of another Species? Or can the Church be a thousand years without its Supreme Government?

Arg. 4. If General Councils be the Supreme Legislative Power, then the Church hath had no such Councils-Laws for all the foreſaid vacancies (300 years firſt, and ſince 601, a thousand years after.) But the Adverſaries will not allow the conſequent ; (that all the Canons of General Councils were no Laws ſo long :) But the antecedent is proved from the definition of Laws, which are the ſignification of the Sovereigns Will to be the Rule of the Subjects Right (actions and dues.) There is no Law which is not the Rulers Law ; and if the Ruler be dead, the Law is dead : For a dead man hath neither Authority nor Will.

Obj. Our Laws die not with the King, nor at the diſſolution of Parliaments.

Anſ. 1. The Law ſaith, *Rex non moritur*. As ſoon as he is dead, the next Heir is King, and the Law is his Law, he being by the Conſtitution (by Contract) obliged to own it, and Govern by it. 2. And Parliaments have their part in the Legislation as Representatives or Truſtees of the People, and therefore the Laws are called thoſe *quas vulgus elegerit*. But the People die not at the diſſolving of a Parliament. 3. At leaſt it's of apparent neceſſity that the *Supreme Executive Power* ſurvive, or elſe the Laws die : For whoſe Laws are they, if we had no King or Sovereign? Whom do we obey or diſobey in obeying or diſobeying ſuch Laws? But our oppoſers ſay, that even the Supreme Executive as well as Legislative Power

is in General Councils. If so, their Laws are dead a thousand years; and we cannot disobey or obey dead men: Therefore why do you press us to obey their Laws?

Arg. 5. If God would have had such Councils to be the Universal Sovereigns, he would have notified this plainly in his Word, or in Nature; it being supposed the Constitutive Form of the Church, or at least necessarily to be known for the common Duty and Concord of Christians: Our opposers say, [*There is no Concord nor avoiding damnable Schism, but by obeying the Universal Governing Church.*] But God hath notified no such thing in Nature or Scripture.

Arg. 6. If God would have his Church Universal to have had such a Sovereign, he would have empowered some one or more to call such a Council, and told us who hath the power to call them, that we may know which have Authority and are to be obeyed: For there have been many false and heretical General Councils (so called;) and they have cursed and condemned one another. But God hath given us no notice of any empowered to call such a Council, nor any means how to know which of them is true, and which false, which to obey, and which not; whatever the Pope pretendeth.

Arg. 7. All the Inferior Officers derive their Power from the Supreme: But all the particular Bishops and Presbyters do not derive their Power from General Councils; *ergo* they are not Supreme.

The *Major* is undoubted with all Politick Writers: It is one of the *Jura Majestatis* to be the Fountain of Inferior Power.

The

The *Minor* is notorious *de facto* in the common History of the Church: By the National Orders of the Roman Empire, Councils had a chief Power in case of difference to determine of the five Patriarchs; but not necessarily to chuse them, nor did they consecrate them; nor was this without the Empire; nor did these Patriarchs make the other Bishops. The Papists dare not determine whether Election or Consecration necessarily make a Bishop, or whether it must be both: For which ever be necessary (distinguished from invalid acts) their Popes and Bishops are nulled; much more if both. But neither of them was appropriate to General Councils.

Arg. 8. The Sovereign Government of the Universal Church, is supposed necessary to its Unity, and to avoiding of Schism, and deciding Controversies, and therefore its Laws are necessary to be Preached to all the Flocks. But none of this is true as to the Sovereignty of a Council: For the Church had Unity mostly without it, and subsists without it at this day; and few Subjects know its Laws, and few Preachers preach them, or People think they are bound to learn them.

Arg. 9. Christ hath appropriated the Sovereignty and Universal Legislation and Judgment to himself alone: Therefore it is not committed to a Council.

The Antecedent is proved fully by 1 Cor. 11. 3. 1 Cor. 12. 27, &c. Col. 1. 18. & 2. 10, 17, 19. Eph. 1. 22, 23. Eph. 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. to 16. 1 Cor. 6. 16, 17. Gal. 3. 28. 1 Cor. 3. 3, 4, 5. & 4. 6. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. Matth. 22. 25, 26. Luke 22. 26.

Arg. 10. They that will claim so great a Power as to be the Sovereigns of the Christian World,

World, must shew a clear Commission for it : But Universal Councils can shew no such Commission.

Arg. 11. If an Universal Council of Bishops be the Supreme Governours of the Universal Church, they that call them not, or they that come not together, live in most damnable sin : For all Office consisteth in *Obligation* to do the duty, as well as Power to do it. And to neglect so many hundred years a work of such unspeakable need, must be more damnable than to neglect a particular Flock ; so that this casts either all the Bishops of the World into damnation, as most perfidious men, or the Pope for not calling them.

Arg. 12. The necessity of such an Universal Supreme Senate is feigned and false ; therefore none such is of God.

1. The great pretended necessity is of Universal Legislation : But that is not necessary. For Christ hath already given his Church as many Laws as are universally necessary : No man can prove the necessity of one more.

2. Nor is their Universal Judging Office necessary : For,

Arg. 13. A General Council is not capable of Universal Supreme Government : Therefore they were never by God appointed to it.

1. They are not capable of Universal Legislation.

1. Because Christ hath made perfect Universal Laws, and forbidden all addition to them ; that is, at least all of the same kind. To say that Christ hath left out any of universal necessity, is to say, that he hath done his work by the halves, and
men

men must mend it; especially if it be in necessary things. If it be but undetermined Circumstances or Accidents, then 1. None can know which of them agree with all Countries on Earth. 2. Those that agree this year may not be agreeable the next. 3. Nor is an Agreement in more than Christ hath determined necessary at all. So that here is no work for them to do.

2. And what is the Judiciary Power that they can use? No man can tell what. 1. They cannot judge of particular Persons to be Baptized whether they are fit. All the Bishops of the World must not meet to try a Catechumen. 2. Nor yet of Persons that are to be Confirmed and admitted to adult Communion: 3. Nor of Persons accused of Heresie or Scandal: No one is so mad as to say that an Universal Council must be gathered out of all the Earth to judge whether *A.* do justly accuse *B.* of these Crimes, and to hear all men speak for themselves, and to Examine the Witnesses, &c.

And whole Cities, and Kingdoms are not fit for Church Censures, because they are mixt of righteous and unrighteous, and *noxa Caput sequitur*: Every man must answer for his own Sin, and every one must have his own Repentance. And if whole Countries are to be Judged, whole Countries of Witnesses must be heard. And shall the Council come to them, or they all go to the Council? and whither? and when?

If it be *Causes* and not *Persons* that they must judge, what are they if they be no *Persons Causes*? If only Cases of Doctrine and Conscience in general, as the Expounding hard Texts of Scripture, or Points of Divinity; This is not properly a Judi-

ciary Executive Power, which is ever subsequent to the Subjects actions ; but it is a part of the antecedent Power ; If it be but *Instructing* it is the act of a Teacher ; If generally obliging it is the act of the Legislator's : For it is his Prerogative to be the universally obliging Expositor of the Law, who is the Maker of it : And it's more to Give the sence, than to endite the bare words. So that here is no Universal Legislation or Jurisdiction left for a Sovereign Council : Nor any that they are capable of.

LV. *Much less can all the Bishops out of Council living all over the Earth, as one College, Senate or Aristocracy, be the Supreme Governing Power of all the Churches and Christians on Earth, having no possible Capacity thereof.*

If our new Church Bishops and Drs. had not fixed on this as the Universal Supremacy, I should have expected a sharp censure for judging any so—as to own it. The same Arguments forementioned confute it?

Arg. 1. The diffused College of Bishops out of Council never did *make Laws* for the Church Universal : Therefore they are not *its Law-makers* or *Supreme Legislative Rulers*.

Arg. 2. They have never (much less always) exercised an *Universal decisive Judiciary Power* : Therefore they were never appointed to exercise it. The Church could not obey that Power that was never used by such as *Judges*.

Arg. 3. If God had given them this Power, he would somewhere have plainly told us of it, and directed them and us how to use it : But this he hath not done.

Arg. 4.

Arg. 4. The Assertors of this while they would extoll the Clergy, cruelly Judge them by Consequence to Damnation, for never performing so great a Duty as Universal Legislation and Jurisdiction; if God did oblige them to it.

Arg. 5. For the diffusive Clergy or Bishops of all the Earth out of Council to Govern all Christians on Earth as one College or Senate, which all must obey, is a thing of such notorious natural Impossibility, that I once thought I should never have heard a Man, much less a Christian, yea a Dr. and Bishop, yea, many maintain.

1. For must they all agree that their acts may be valid in Legislation or Decisive Judgment, or must it be a Major Vote? No doubt they'll say the latter. And who shall propose and draw up the Laws?

2. Who shall carry them all over the World to procure Votes?

3. Who shall gather the Votes, and Judge of the Majority?

4. Shall they Vote and Judge without ever consulting each other, and hearing what be said on every side?

5. How many Messengers must there be to go into all the World? And who shall bear their Charges?

6. How shall we be sure when they come home that they have truly taken the Votes? Will not all our Faith be resolved into the Credit of these Messengers?

7. Must accused Persons and Witnesses travel all over the World to be Judged? or must all the Bishops on Earth come to them?

8. How many Millions of Criminals will a Bishop have to hear at once, or Judge?

The

The Case is so gross that I am afraid you will say, I feign Reverend Men to be Mad. That which they say is, *That there is no Concord to be had, nor avoiding of Schism but by obeying the Universal Governing Church, which is the College of all the Pastors and Bishops on Earth, who have as such a Supreme Power under Christ of Legislation and Judgment, which they exercise per literas formatas.*

There is no way to excuse this—but by feigning that this College of Bishops is to do these great works not by themselves, but by a College of Delegates or Representatives, viz. Either Cardinals or Patriarchs: or else by reducing the whole Church on Earth to the narrow compass of some little Sect, and condemning most of the Christian World, that they may not seem to need them, for Legislation or Judgment. And these I have sufficiently confuted before.

LVI. The Universal Supreme Government either of Council or the College of the diffused Clergy, is more impossible and unpracticable, and much worse than the Sovereignty of the Pope.

For, 1. The Pope is a known Person, and it's possible to find him, to send to him, to hear from him.

2. He is One, and it's possible to know his Mind without gathering Votes or *Literas formatas* all over the Earth.

3. Most may send to him and hear his decision at least in an Age.

4. What he cannot do by himself he can depute others to do.

5. He is almost always in being, and the Church need not be so many Hundred Years headless or without it's Sovereign Power.

6. He

6. He hath some Cob-web shadow of right, in the *Tu es Petrus*, and *Tibi dabo Claves*, and *Pasce oves*: But as to the said College and Council, all this and more is contrary.

So that I do deliberately profess, that if I did believe that there were any Universal Supreme Rector or Ministerial specifying *Unifying, Constitutive Head or Governour* under Christ, I should soon resolve that it is the Pope, there being no Competitor so little uncapable as he.

And all the Papists save a few Flatterers acknowledge that the Popes Power is not absolute and unlimited, and that he hath need of Councils as the King hath of Parliaments, not for constant Government, but partly for *Legislation*, which belongs not to the Pope alone, and partly for *Medicinal* reparation and execution; when the Church is diseased. So that they that are for the Pope as the stated Supreme, are for Councils also, and would use Councils better than the Aristocratical, that give them the Supreme Government, would use them. All men know that they are rarely in being. Even Bishop *Guning* saith he receiveth but the first Six General Councils: To say, the Church hath been headless, or without it's Supreme Government just a Thousand Years, and is so still, is to make it invisible in an Essential Part.

Is there now a visible Catholick Church, or is there none? If none, why would they silence and damn us all for not obeying that which is not? If there be, where and what is the *Pars regens*, the constitutive visible Supremacy? If in a Council there is none. If in the College of diffused Bishops all over the World, they are no Governors, they

they never so made Laws, they Govern not as such, and so are no such Governors. They only Govern *per partes*, in their several Precincts, as all the English Justices of the Peace, Mayors, Bailiffs and Judges do, and not as an Aristocracy. But if it be a Church now because there is a Pope, say so, and hide not your opinion. We say it is a Church because there is a Christ and Christians; and we know no other Matter and Form.

LVII. They that assert a Supremacy in a Council or College of Bishops, do unavoidably introduce a Pope.

If they will call none a *Pope* but him that is absolute and unlimited (and no Man a King, but an absolute unlimited Monarch) we will speak according to common use, and let them speak as their Interest dictates to them, but remember that the Controversie is but about the *Name*, and not the *Thing*. We take the French Church for Papists, if they will call them Protestants, they are free. But if we are agreed what a Pope is, the case is plain, as followeth.

I. Mr. *Dodwell* (their most Learned defender, if number of words or greatest self-conceit be the chief strength) tells you that if the Council be not lawfully called, it obligeth you rather to bring them to Punishment as a Rout or Rebels, than to obey them: And that none but the President hath Power to call them. (And remember yet that this good Man is no Papist.) And indeed who else but the Pope should call Universal Councils? The King in *Scotland* may call a Scotch General Assembly, and in *England* a Convocation and Parliament; And, 1. The Emperor of *Rome* or *Constantinople* might call such Councils in the Empire as were then

then called General; and did so. But who now shall call one out of *France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, Britain, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Moscow, the Turkish Empire, Armenia, Georgia, Mengrelia, Tartary, Abassia, Mexico, Peru, China, &c.* We are awake, and therefore cannot Dream of Princes doing it by Agreement. We are yet out of *Bedlam*, and cannot conclude that all the Bishops in the World will come together by common consent, or as the Atomists say the World was made, by a fortuitous concurrence of Atomes.

2. How shall lawful Councils be known from unlawful, if none have Authority to call, approve, and difference them? If only *ex factis*, by their good or bad Deeds, half the World will Judge (as they have done and do) one Council to be spurious which another obeyeth.

3. What order shall be kept among them, if none have Authority to appoint the Place, the Time, to Preside and Moderate, and to dissolve them? and who pretends to this but the Pope?

4. When Councils Contradict, Condemn and Curse each other, who shall tell us which of them to receive, believe, and obey?

II. And if we must have a visible Supreme Power, we must have one that successively existeth, that the Church be not dissolved. And none pretendeth to this but the Pope.

III. And if all National & Patriarchal Churches be but Parts of a visible Catholick Church with a Humane Supremacy, then there must be some Power still existent to give Patriarchs and Metropolitans their Power: Mr. *Dodwell* saith it overthrowes all Government to appeal to Scripture as a Charter or Law of Christ: None hath more
than

than the Giver intended him: None can give that which he hath not to give. The Inferior hath not Power to give to the Superior: Who then but a Pope can give Patriarchs and Metropolitans their Power? If for want of Authoritative Collation of Power, all the Presbyterian Ordinations, Sacraments, and Covenant-hopes of Salvation are Nullities and Sins against the Holy Ghost, as Mr. *Dodwell* and his Tribe say; what better are all the Bishops and Archbishops for want of a Superior conferring Power? which none pretendeth to but the Pope.

IV. And who else shall judge Patriarchs, Metropolitans, and National Churches, when they prove Hereticks or Schismatics? Their Heresie and Schism is far more heinous and dangerous than single Persons or Congregations. And Councils are not extant: And we cannot send all over the Earth to gather Bishops Votes against them unheard. It must be a Pope or no body on Earth, that must by Governing Authority Judge them.

V. And who else shall be the stated Judge of new started Controversies? You say, such there must be? shall they be undecided till the World have a true general Council?

VI. And who shall an injured Person appeal to from a Tyrannical Metropolitan or National Church, but to the Pope?

Many more clear Necessities there will be of a Pope on their Principles. I blamed the Author of the *Divine Hierarchy*, for naming such without an Antidote, lest it should make men Papists: But I understand he is a worthy Protestant: But verily there is no avoiding a Pope, by any that assert an *Universal humane Church Supremacy*.

VII. And indeed I must not suppose them so immodest as to deny it. For it is but the Pope's Absolute Power above the Councils and their Laws, and not Simple Popery, or the Pope's limited Power that they deny. 1. They confess that they hold *Rome* for the Mistress Church, as *Grotius* calls it; 2. And that the Pope is Patriarch of the West, and the prime Patriarch; 3. And that he is *Principium Unitatis* to all the Church on Earth: And if so, they are out of the Church which is One, that deny this. 4. That he is authorized to call General Councils: 5. And to be their President, 6. And to be the chief Governor when there are no General Councils, (and that is indeed always.) 7. And that they are all Schismatics that do not thus far submit to him. And how much more Mr. *Dodwell* giveth the President, I have shewed you in his own words.

VIII. As Mr. *Thorndike* threateneth *England* with God's Judgments, if they do not amend the Oath of Supremacy, by making it acceptable to the Papists that renounce not a foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, so others labour to prove that the meaning of it is only to renounce the Pope's Jurisdiction here in Temporals which belongs to the King, and not a Papal and Foreign Jurisdiction, properly Ecclesiastical by the Keys: As you may see partly in Mr. *Hutchinson's* alias *Berry's* Book, who on that Supposition took the Oath, (as many do) and publickly profest himself of the Church of *England*.

IX. In the Description of the Reconciliation with the Pope, endeavoured by Archbishop *Land* in *Heylin's* History of his Life, *Pag.* 414, 415, &c. All that the Pope was to abate was, 1. That the Oaths

Oaths of Supremacy and Fidelity may be taken (I told you in what sense.) 2. And that the Pope's Jurisdiction here (but no where else) be declared to be of Humane Right (that is, say ours, by the *Fathers in General Councils not without the Apostles, by whose Church-Laws we are all bound.*) 3. That all should be really performed to the King, so far as other Catholick Princes usually enjoy and expect as their due, and so far as the Bishops were to be independent both from King and Pope (but not from subjection to either.) This (saith he) no man of Learning and Sobriety would have grudged to grant him. 4. Marriage permitted to Priests. 5. The Communion in both kinds. 6. The Liturgy in English.

I ask any sober man now,

2u. 1. Whether the Pope did himself think that by this bargain he ceased to be Pope, and all Papists to be Papists?

2. Whether if the King had been thus far equalled with other Catholick Princes, the Pope would not have supposed him, and his Bishops and Church to be of the same Roman Catholick Church as they?

3. Whether in all this here be any renunciation of the Popes Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in *England*, but only of the Divine Right of it?

4. Whether here be any renunciation of his claimed Universal Jurisdiction over all the Church on Earth?

5. Whether such an Universal Church Monarch (by Humane Right with some and Divine with others) be consistent with the Protestant Doctrine, and that of the Former Church of *England*?

6. Whe-

6. Whether such a Bargain be the way to save us from Popery ?

7. What to call or think of those Archbishops, Bishops, and Drs that are for such a Bargain, and for Silencing two Thousand such Ministers as were Silenced, and Ruining those that forsake them not, and yet cry down Popery, and accuse those whom they Silence, and Ruine as befriending it ? Readers, Did you think till Experience told you that *England* had had such Clergy men ? And do you not yet understand them ?

LVIII. The whole Christian World (or all the Earth) is less capable of one Ecclesiastical Monarch or Supreme Aristocracy, than of one Civil Monarch.

This is easily proved to any that will understand what Church Government is.

1. Church Government consisteth in judging of the state of Mens Souls whether they are capable of Baptism, and the Communion of Saints, and the Remission of Sin, and whether their Professions be so sound in matter and understood by them, and their practices such as shew them capable or not ? And an outward matter of fact with its circumstances, which Magistrates judge, is far easier judged of than all this in the understanding, will and practice.

2. It is about matters of supernatural Revelation and heavenly Mystery, which is not so easily known as Natural and Civil things.

3. It is a work of personal ability and performance, like a School-masters, or Physicians, and can less be done by delegation.

4. There is no rule, or warrant in Scripture for such delegation, which Magistrates may use. Nor

for Church-Rulers making new sorts of Officers under them to do their Journey-work, which Princes may undoubtedly make.

5. All that are under such a Supreme, must have far greater sufficiency for their Ecclesiastical work, than every Civil or Military Officer needs for his, as the different works require.

6 Such an Universal Monarch or Senate would be supposed still in being, and so the Mundane Empire not dissolved; which here cannot be supposed.

7. Such a Monarch or Senate would be in some known place of the World where men might hear of them and find them. But it's not so here, specially as to the Sovereign College of Bishops or Council.

8. Such a Monarch or Civil Senate would be supposed to be Lords of all the World, and therefore to have Wealth enough to pay Shipping, Travelling, Messengers, Officers, and discharge all Publick Expences: But so hath not the Imaginary College or Council, no nor the Pope and Conclave.

9. Such a Monarch or Senate commanding all the World, would not have most of the Kingdoms of the Earth the Enemies of them, and hinderers of their work; whereas the Bishops have not the leave of one Prince of many to assemble and govern.

10. Such a Monarch or Senate would have no Superior on earth but God, to forbid and hinder them. Whereas our imaginary diffused College and Council, are themselves the Subjects of abundance of Princes, Orthodox, Heterodox, Infidels, Heathens, who are their Commanders, and

may

may hinder them : So that our Universalists plead that on necessity to the Concord and Being of Christ's Church, all the Christian World must be under the Supreme Government of thousands of the Subjects of various Princes, most of them Enemies : When all Church-History and Experience have told the World, how much Princes can do on their subject Clergy.

LIX. To make the Church of *England* a subject part of the Church Universal as Governed by a Foreign Supreme Power, (Pope, Council or College) is to make it *totâ specie*, quite another thing from what the Protestant Church of *England*; and the other Protestant Churches are.

Proved ; where the *Supreme Government* is altered or divers, the *Species* of the Society is altered or divers. No man that knows what Government is, will deny this. But here the *Supreme Government* would be altered or divers. For the Protestant Churches own no Supreme Universal Governour but Christ. And that the Church of *England* owneth no such, I will prove anon.

2. A Kingdom, and a part of a Kingdom ; a compleat Political Body, and the meer Part of such a Body (as a Corporation) are not of the same Species : But the Protestant Church of *England* is a compleat Society in it self, and the Church of *England* as a meer part of a greater Society is not so. As Christ's Kingdom and the Kings differ, so we maintain that the Kingdom of *England*, as such, and as a meer part of Christ's Kingdom, are of different *Species* : And it would be so as to a Humane Universal Kingdom, were there any such.

3. A Kingdom or Church under no Laws but Gods and their own, are not of the same Species with a Kingdom or Church under Foreign Laws above their own. And so it's here supposed.

4. A Kingdom and Church whose Justices, Judges, Captains and all Officers receive their Power and Commission from a Foreign Sovereign Power, is specifically divers from that which doth not: And so it is here.

5. A Kingdom and Church which may be punished by a Supreme Foreign Power, and must be judged by them, is not of the same Species with that which may not. But, &c.

6. A Kingdom and Church whose Subjects may appeal from their own King or Church-Governours to a Foreign Power, are not of the same Species with that which may not: But the two Churches in question so differ: Therefore they are not of the same Species: And therefore Mr. *Thorndike* and such, truly acknowledge this as their foundation, that without owning *One Universal Governing Church*, there is no Union, nor true Consistence in the particulars.

The Consequence is evident, That the Church, which according to Dr. *Heylin*, A. Bishop *Laud* would have had, and which A. Bishop *Bromhall*, and his Defender Dr. *Parker*, and *Grotius*; and his Defender Dr. *Pierce*, and Bishop *Guning* and his Chaplain Dr. *Saywell*, and Mr. *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwell*, Bishop *Sparrow*, and all of that mind are for, is not the Protestant Church of *England*, nor at all a true Protestant Church: But as far as I can understand their words, it is the same Visible Church-Form, (and Government) which the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* were for, and which

which the Papists French Church is for ; (unless there be any worse in the French Church-form than yet I know of.)

LX. We are further from denying or violating the Churches Unity, than they are, that feign an Universal Humane Sovereignty: Nor doth our opposition to Popery exclude our resolution as much as in us lieth, to live peaceably with Papists, and with all men.

I. We hold (as aforesaid) that all Christians are united in One God, one Christ the Sovereign, one Body of Christ, one Faith, one Baptismal-Covenant with Christ, one Spirit, one Hope of Grace and Glory; and must keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace: And that all Subjects must obey their Rulers and Pastors in all lawful things belonging to their Office to command and teach. And that as Particular Churches must be held for the *Personal Communion* of Saints; so all these Churches must by Messengers, Letters and Synods hold such correspondency, as the common good of the Universal Church and their own strength and edification by the means of mutual *COUNSEL* and *CONCORD* do require.

II. Accordingly we make not Regent Senates or Courts of such Councils, to make Laws for the Christian World: But they are like the Assemblies of pious Christian Princes, who study the Peace of the whole Christian World. Princes are bound so to do as well as Pastors: That they *do not*, proveth not that they *ought not*: Their Kingdoms are but parts of the Kingdom of Christ. If they should hold an Assembly in *Europe* for the suppressing of such a Heresie as threatneth the whole, or such a Tyrant as the

Pope, or such an Enemy as the Turk, it were well done, and had the same reasons and power as a Council of Bishops. Bishops may not undertake Jurisdiction in other mens Bishopricks, nor Kings in other mens Kingdoms. Bishops are bound to prefer the universal good, and so are Kings.

III. And therefore the measure of such Communion by Consultation, by Messengers, Letters, or Councils, is, 1. The publick good; 2. And the capacity of the Communicants.

We have Communion with all Christians in *Abassia, Armenia*, and all the Earth, in Faith, Hope, Love, and all the Essentials of Christianity: But if *John* or *Joan* here commit Adultery, and be excommunicated as impenitent, we are not bound to send Messengers to the Antipodes, or all the World, to tell them of it; no nor if a Bishop or his Chaplain turn Heretick: Nor are they bound to send hither to enquire or examine it. And if the Excommunicate come to *Armenia*, and desire Communion, they are justifiable for receiving him, and being ignorant of our Excommunication. But Neighbour Christians and Churches live so near, that they are capable of converse: And therefore Synods and Communicatory Letters are there of great use: And so far as an Excommunicate man is like to intrude into the Communion of other Churches, it is meet that his Excommunication be published, and that other Churches receive him not without just satisfaction. And so Councils are useful as far as propinquity maketh men capable of visible Communion: Especially to Pastors and Churches in one Kingdom, where the Unity of the Civil Government giveth them more capacity and necessity

sity of such Correspondency, than with Foreigners. And therefore the Councils in the same Roman Empire had great reason for their Decrees to avoid those Excommunicate by each other.

And yet many Councils, even under the Papacy decreed that he that is unjustly Excommunicate by one Bishop may be received by another : But that supposeth his tryal and proof of the Injury.

Therefore we come not so near the Universal Sovereignty of Councils as Dr. *Stillingfleet* in the Defence of A. Bishop *Laud*, tells us *Laud* whom he defended doth. Who will have the old Councils confessed *truly General*, notwithstanding the absence of the Extra-Imperial Bishops, 2. And will have such Councils to have been received (the Four first) by *all the Christian World*, when it's known how many rejected that at *Chalcedon*. 3. And will have such Councils to be *externally obeyed by patient submission* when they *notoriously err*, by *all Christians* till another Council as General and Free reverse their Decrees. 4. And will have them have such Obedience as all other Courts. For *meer Councils of Bishops of several Kingdoms* are no Courts, and have no proper Jurisdiction.

Chap. II. *Why Parliaments and Archbishop Abbot and the Church of England Antecedent to A. Bishop Laud, were against the Design of Coalition with Rome.*

§ 1. IT was not because they were Enemies to Christian Concord, or did not desire it on
 Ec 4 lawful

lawful possible terms with Papists and all others; Nor was it because they were maliciously bent to be cruel to the Papists, by denying them the common Love which is due to Mankind, or any Benefits or Peace which was consistent with the Nations Peace and Safety. But it was on such Reasons as these following.

§ 2. I. They took the design to be a real restoring of Popery under the Name of Reconciliation and Peace; And they had an excuseable Opinion that if Popery were set up, it was not laying by the Name, and calling it Reformation, or the Church of *England*, that would deliver us from the Sin or Suffering. They were not of the new Opinion, that none are Papists but those that would have the Pope Absolute above General Councils, and Govern Arbitrarily against the Canons: They took the foundation of Popery to be the Heresie that *the whole Church on Earth must have one Sovereign or Supream Government, with Universal Legislative and Judicial and Executive Power under Christ, in which it must be United or made One Church.* This they took to be Antichristian, the intolerable Treasonable Usurpation of an Impossible thing, tending to the Confusion of Mankind. But whether this Traiterous Sovereignty should be Monarchical or Aristocratical, in Pope or Councils feigned to be General; or in both Conjunct, and when Conjunct whether the Pope should be above the Council, or the Council above the Pope, or each have a Negative Voice, or he have but the Calling and Presiding Power; They took these to be but several sorts of Popery, or differences among the Papists themselves. And they took it for a ridiculous absurdity that a Council of men dead an

Hundred

Hundred or a Thousand Years ago (and that only of men of one Empire called by their own Prince) should be taken for the *Unifying Constitutive Sovereign Power* of the Universal Church which now existeth, and that the Body can live many Hundred Years after the Head is dead, and yet be a Church of the same Species.

And for them that say the Bishops of all the Earth have a *Jus Conveniendi* and are a *Virtual Council*, It is but to say (could they prove it) that they are a *Virtual Head*, and not an *Actual*, and so that we have no *Actual Universal Church*, but a *Virtual*.

And as for the new Dream that they are *Actually* the Supreme Unifying Power, and *Actually* Govern the whole Christian World *per literas formatas*, it's a sad case with Christians when such deliration needs a confutation, and sadder if such a Land or Clergy as ours must remedilessly Perish by believing or following such a Dream. Shall all the Bishops of *Asia, Africa, Europe and America*, out of the Dominions of the *Turks, Persians, Tartarians, Indians, Papists, Protestants, Abassines, &c.* meet in despite of their involuntary forbidding Princes? *How*, and by whose Call, and *where* and *when*? in how long time; and who shall bear their Charges from next to the *Antipodes*, or from *Abassia, Mexico, &c.* Must they be old Men fit for Council; or Boys fit for Travel, when the age of a Man will scarce serve for their coming together, their business, and their return, and execution? And what's all this to do? Is it to make new Universal Laws? Hath not Christ in Nature and Scripture given us enow for the Practice of Christianity, without all this ado of Congregating

lawful possible terms with Papists and all others; Nor was it because they were maliciously bent to be cruel to the Papists, by denying them the common Love which is due to Mankind, or any Benefits or Peace which was consistent with the Nations Peace and Safety. But it was on such Reasons as these following.

§ 2. I. They took the design to be a real restoring of Popery under the Name of Reconciliation and Peace; And they had an excuseable Opinion that if Popery were set up, it was not laying by the Name, and calling it Reformation, or the Church of *England*, that would deliver us from the Sin or Suffering. They were not of the new Opinion, that none are Papists but those that would have the Pope Absolute above General Councils, and Govern Arbitrarily against the Canons: They took the foundation of Popery to be the Heresie that *the whole Church on Earth must have one Sovereign or Supream Government, with Universal Legislative and Judicial and Executive Power under Christ, in which it must be United or made One Church.* This they took to be Antichristian, the intolerable Treasonable Usurpation of an Impossible thing, tending to the Confusion of Mankind. But whether this Traiterous Sovereignty should be Monarchical or Aristocratical, in Pope or Councils feigned to be General; or in both Conjunct, and when Conjunct whether the Pope should be above the Council, or the Council above the Pope, or each have a Negative Voice, or he have but the Calling and Presiding Power; They took these to be but several sorts of Popery, or differences among the Papists themselves. And they took it for a ridiculous absurdity that a Council of men dead an

Hundred

Hundred or a Thousand Years ago (and that only of men of one Empire called by their own Prince) should be taken for the *Unifying Constitutive Sovereign Power* of the Universal Church which now existeth, and that the Body can live many Hundred Years after the Head is dead, and yet be a Church of the same Species.

And for them that say the Bishops of all the Earth have a *Jus Conveniendi* and are a *Virtual Council*, It is but to say (could they prove it) that they are a *Virtual Head*, and not an *Actual*, and so that we have no *Actual Universal Church*, but a *Virtual*.

And as for the new Dream that they are *Actually* the Supreme Unifying Power, and *Actually* Govern the whole Christian World *per literas formatas*, it's a sad case with Christians when such deliration needs a confutation, and sadder if such a Land or Clergy as ours must remedilessly Perish by believing or following such a Dream. Shall all the Bishops of *Asia, Africa, Europe and America*, out of the Dominions of the *Turks, Persians, Tartarians, Indians, Papists, Protestants, Assassines, &c.* meet in despite of their involuntary forbidding Princes? *How*, and by whose Call, and *where* and *when*? in how long time; and who shall bear their Charges from next to the *Antipodes*, or from *Abassia, Mexico, &c.* Must they be old Men fit for Council; or Boys fit for Travel, when the age of a Man will scarce serve for their coming together, their business, and their return, and execution? And what's all this to do? Is it to make new Universal Laws? Hath not Christ in Nature and Scripture given us enow for the Practice of Christianity, without all this ado of Congregating

ting Bishops for Legislation all over the World? Oh that these Law-makers would keep Christ's Laws? And if it be for mutable Circumstances, is not every Church or Countrey sufficient for such variable Determinations? Must men come from the *Antipodes*, *Ethiopia* or *Turky*, to tell me here what Cloaths I must wear, or what place or time I shall Preach in, or what Tune to Sing in, &c.

But if they must not meet, what Messengers must be sent to them all over the World to gather their Votes? How shall we be sure that they truly state all the Cases to them? And that they truly bring us back their Judgments? And that those Judgments were truly past without hearing what could be said against them? And is every single Bishop infallible; or the Majority only? and how shall it be known what the Majority said? And whither shall all their collected Votes be carried, and to whom? Is it to every Christian, or to every Bishop? And how many Ages will this require?

And if it be not for Legislation but Judgment, if the Question be whether *A. B.* be a Heretick, or *C. D.* be a Fornicator, &c. who shall bear the Messengers Charges that must go through the World to all the Bishops to decide it? And shall the Cause be tryed without witnesses, or hearing the defence of the accused? And must the accused and witnesses go through all the World? Reader, is it not a shame to confute such Dreams? Had not I tryed in with the Leading Men I should have taken him for a Slanderer that had said that any English Dr. and Bishop should maintain that the Collegium Pastorum *through the World*, is
that

that *summa Potestas* under Christ, which hath the Chief Government of the Universal Church in Unity, per literas formatas, and that our Concord lyeth only in obeying this Power, and it's Schism not to unite in such Obedience.

§ 3. II. Moreover the former Church of England and Parliaments thought that the Oath of Supremacy which excluded a Foreign Jurisdiction, did mean as well the Foreign Jurisdiction of the Pope as President of a Council, and that Council with him, and of the Pope as Patriarch and *Principium Unitatis*, and of the Bishops of Italy, Spain, France, Poland, Mexico, Turkey, &c. as of a Pope above Councils. And they were not willing again to Subject the King and Kingdom to Foreign Priests, nor to be cheated into Slavery by the bare Name of [the *Catholic Church*] and the [*Ecclesiastical Government*.]

§ 4. III. And they indeed took the Pope to be the Antichrist, (specially for his Usurping an Universal Kingdom or Governing Power proper to Christ) And therefore were angry with Archbishop *Laud* and his Chaplains, for leaving out all such words from the Liturgy to avoid the Pope's displeasure; of which Dr. *Heylin* (*ubi sup.*) giveth you an account. See but Bishop *Downname's* large Latine Book to prove the Pope Antichrist, who yet hath written the strongliest for Diocesan Bishops of any man (in my Judgment) that ever I read.

§ 5. IV. And they thought that the Doctrinal differences were very many and very great (and in divers Points I believe they thought them greater than they are) see the huge Catalogue gathered by Bishop *Downname* in the End of the foresaid

foresaid Book; *Morton, White, Whitaker, Abbot, Field, Sutcliffe, Chaloner, Bernard, Crakenthorpe*, and abundance more chief Drs. of the old Church of *England* have opened them at large. But how small the new Drs. made them to be Dr. *Heylin* fully tells you. And Archbishop *Bromhall* saith (*ubi sup.* p. 72, 73. when all these empty Names and Titles of Controversies are wiped out of the Roll, the true Controversies between us, may be quickly Mustered, &c. (See the rest).

§ 6. V. But none doubted but the Differences about Worship were unreconcilable till one Party much changed their Forms of Worship: Their great Mass of superstitious Inventions (if not Idolatry, as the Church of *England* thought, (and Dr. *Stillingfleet* even of late hath charged on them) Protestants could never be reconciled to. But of A Bishop *Land's* reconciling attempts in Worship, See *Heylin Ubi supra* in his Life. And Archbishop *Bromhall* saith, P. 141. Speaking against *Cbillingworth's* true way of Concord, [That Form which the Protestants would allow, the Romanists cry out on as defective in Necessary Duties, and particularly wanting five of their Sacraments. Nay certainly to call the whole frame of the Liturgy

* The Mass Book. * into Dispute, offers too large a Field for Contention; and is nothing so likely a way for Peate, as either for us to accept of their Form*, abating some such Parts of it as are Confessed to have been added since the Primitive times, and are acknowledged not to be simply necessary but such as charitable Christians ought to give up and Sacrifice to an Universal Peace, and would do it readily enough, if it were not for mutual Animosities of both Parties, and particular Interests of some Persons.]

§ 7. VI. And they thought it as unlawful to obey the Pope as Patriarch of the West, or as President with his Council, if he imposed on us the Mass, or the Worship of Angels, Dead Men, or Images, or any new Sacraments or unlawful things, as if he did it as above General Councils.

§ 8. VII. And they made no doubt but if the Pope and his Foreign Councils (and all his attendant Trumpery) were once received as *Principium Unitatis Universalis* and the President of Councils, he would soon come in, in the same Capacity that other Popish Countries do receive him.

§ 9. VIII. For they knew that it is that same Man that is more absolute in Popish Kingdoms, who would submit to some restraint in this: And that by Possession, Agents, and that foreign help, he would easilier reduce this to the Case of others, than the Case of any others to this.

§ 10. IX. They had not lost the Remembrance of the Spanish Invasion, the Gunpowder Plot, and the many Treasons of late by such committed; and it made them fear both the Power and the Company of such a sort of men.

§ 11. X. They remembered the heavy Taxes, Oppressions and the Rebellions and Wars that had been in the times of Popery in *England*. And they had felt the ease and sweetness of Deliverance, and were loth to return to that Captivity again.

12. XI. They had not forgotten *Queen Mary's Days*; *Fox's Book of Martyrs* was in the hands of many: Nor had they forgot the French Massacre, or the greater Murders formerly committed by Wolves in Sheep-skins, who were known by their bloody Fangs and Jaws.

§ 13. XII. They saw that the same Clergymen
who

who were for this Union with *Rome*, were the chief Defenders of the King's absolute Power of raising Money without Parliaments (as the known History of *Abbot's Dejection*, and *Land's Sibthorp's*, and *Mainwaring's Cases* shew.) And this made them the lother to draw nearer Popery.

§ 14. XIII. They found the Power of the Clergy in the High Commission, and their Courts and Councils so uneasy to them, that they greatly feared so great an increase of it as the Coalition with *Rome* would cause.

§ 15. XIV. They found that the Papists and reconciling Prelates were the greatest Enemies to them whom they accounted the most Godly serious Christians, Ministers and Lay-men, not only Nonconformists, but such as they devised to call conformable Puritans. And they were not for Uniting their strength against serious practical Piety.

§ 16. XV. They found that the prophane Drunkards and ignorant Rabble greatly rejoiced in the Bishops prosecuting such Puritans; And were loth to see them much more so animated, by the Coalition with *Rome*.

§ 17. XVI. They found so great a number of the Clergy that were for the Coalition and Enemies to the Puritans, to gape so greedily after Preferment, and live such indifferent lives, and Preach so unprofitably, and do so little to cure the ignorance of the People, as made them fear, much worse, if we came nearer the Roman Clergy, who are so much for blind obedience, and cherishing ignorance that they may Rule.

§ 18. XVII. They did not perceive that the Case of any Popish Country, *Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria;*

Austria, Bavaria, Poland, no, nor *France*, was so much better than ours as might tempt us to be liker to them than we are. Yea, that the best of them both in Civil and Religious Respects are so much worse, as may well deter us from such desires.

§ 19. XVIII. And it's not to be doubted but they made some Conscience of their Obligations to the King, and were loth he should be tempted to give away half the Government of his Kingdom, yea, of himself to Foreigners, under the Name of Ecclesiastical Government, (by such Courts as theirs.)

§ 20. XIX. And no doubt they remembered what Doctrine against Kings and States are subject to the Church and Pope, their Councils and Drs. do assert, and what they have done to their disturbance and destruction. And therefore were loth to give any more strength and advantage to men of such Principles and Pretensions. If the Pope will give a Protestant King fair quarter, and promise him freedom from his Tyranny, while the same man (according to his Canons) layeth claim to more, and exerciseth Tyranny in other Lands, he may soon break his Promise here.

§ 21. XX. And no doubt but they saw how loth other Princes and States were to return nearer *Rome*, that had once escaped, and to subject themselves to such a Usurper: And they thought it unwise and unsafe for *England* to stand alone in a singular odd condition, neither Papists, nor such Reformers as any of the rest, and so to be strengthened by a Concord and hearty Friendship with neither.

§ 22. XXI. And it is not to be doubted but the Lords and Gentlemen of *England*, were unwilling

to

to give up all their Abby Lands, as long as they thought a sufficient Ministry competently provided for: And unwilling to take the Pope or Clergies promises for security for the continuance of their Possessions, yea and to save them from being burnt as Hereticks.

§ 23. XXII. And no doubt but common reason told them how great a part of *England* (not the unwisest nor the worst) would refuse consent to the Coalition with *Rome*, and the nearer approaches when imposed, and therefore what a doleful encrease it would make of our Divisions: If we are so sadly divided already by a few Oaths and Promises, and New Covenants and Formalities, and Church Judicatures, how many hundred thousand more would dissent, if all were imposed which the new Church-men judge necessary to the Union with *Rome*?

§ 24. And these would unavoidably draw on a grievous Persecution: For when all this stir, loss, cost and hazard had been made to bring on such a general Concord, Dissenters would not have been endured by the Clergy, when yet they would be multiplied.

§ 25. And how much such a Division and Persecution would weaken the Kingdom, they that did not believe Christ (that a Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand) might easily know by reason and the Worlds experience.

§ 26. On such accounts as these the two sorts of Episcopal Conformists differed, and the old Tribe called then the *Church of England*, resisted the endeavours made by Bishop *Laud* and such as A. Bishop *Bromhall*, and the rest that were for a Coalition with *Rome*. Till the latter got into
the

the chiefest Chairs, and then they called their side *The Church*: And thus *Church* and *Church* here began our strife. And the difference twisted with the Civil differences between King and Parliament, widened and utterly exasperated by War (the A. Bishop of *Canterbury* beheaded, and the A. Bishop of *York* being in Arms for the Parliament) each Party claimeth the name of the *Church of England*: And the Party that is uppermost doth it with advantage; while sober men know that denominating à *Formâ* as existent in *Materiâ capaci seu dispositâ*, the *Church of England* is nothing but a *Protestant Sovereign*, and a *Protestant Kingdom* of Subjects guided by *Protestant Ministers* of the Word, Sacraments, and Keys.

So that in the Reign of King *James*, and of any *Papist King*, there was, and can be no *Protestant Kingdom* or *National Church*, *deficiente formâ dominante*, in the Judgment of those *Royalists* that think *Parliaments* have no part in the *Legislation* and *Sovereignty*: And according to them that think otherwise, it is but a *National Church* *secundum quid*, in respect to the *Power* of *Parliaments* and *Laws*.

But *Particular Churches*, *Parochial*, and *Confederate*, and *Diocesan* may yet continue their *Constitutive causes* continuing: But not an informed *National Church*.

Chap. III. *They are deceived who are for the
foreſaid Papal or Council-Juriſdiction, as if
it were the way of Unity or Catholicism.*

§ 1. **I** Doubt not but the deſireableneſs of Uni-
verſal Concord is it which draweth many
honest well-meaning men into the eſteem of the
Papal or Conciliar Juriſdiction. All things have
a tendency to Aggregation or Unity as Perfection;
and nothing more than Chriſtian Love. This held
ſuch good men of old as *Bernard, Geſen, &c.* from
favouring the Reformers, thinking that the Papacy
was neceſſary to Unity: This kept ſuch as *Eraſ-
mus* and *Caffander* from forſaking them: And this
turned *Wicelins*, *Grotius* and others to them: And
no doubt but this inclineth many in *England* to
the *French* kind of Church-Government, and to
approve, and follow *Grotius*. But they quite croſs
their own deſires.

§ 2. Catholicism or *Univerſal Concord* conſiſt-
eth in that which all the Chriſtian Church is con-
ſtituted by, and in which all true Chriſtians have
ſtill agreed; *Quod ab omnibus ubiq; & ſemper recep-
tum fuit*, as *Vincent Lerinenſis* ſpeaketh. The
Baptiſmal Profeſſion and Covenant expounded in
the Creed, the Lord's Prayer as the Rule of our
Deſires, and Hope, the Decalogue as the ſum of
Duty, with the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Incarnation,
Life, Death, Reſurrection and Doctrine in the
Gospel-writers, the practice of Baptiſm, and the
Lord's Supper, with Church-Aſſemblies, for
Teaching and Learning, Praying, and Praiſing
God, and this under Elders called thus to Guide
their Flocks, with the belief of all the reſt of the
Sacred

Sacred Scriptures which are brought to our knowledge : This hath been *ab omnibus, ubiq; & semper receptum* : All Christians agree herein : And in the observation of the Lord's day as a separated time for Sacred Assemblies. And some Ceremonies and other little things most of them agreed in, but not as necessary to their Unity, or Communion, but such as some differed about without violation of Christian Love and Peace, as *Socrates* and *Sozomen* shew in divers Instances, and of divers Countreys.

At this day All the Churches agree in these : And this much constituteth men true Christians : And Christ hath commanded all Christians to Love one another, and Live in Peace ; and the strong to receive the weak, and not offend the least Believers, nor to please themselves, but others to their edification. The Kingdom of God (which is his Church) is not meat and drink, but Righteousness, Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost ; and he that in these things serveth Christ, pleaseth God, and is (or should be) approved of men.

I have proved all this so fully in my Book called *The true and only Way of the Concord of all the Churches*, that I here dismiss it.

§ 3. But when this pretended Universal Humane Jurisdiction was set up, it quickly divided the Catholick Church, by making new Laws and Constitutions, as if Christ's Laws had not been sufficient for Universal Concord ; and as if he that made Ministers the Teachers and Expounders of his own Laws, had given them his Prerogative of Universal Legislation and Judgment. And ever since then the Church hath been torn into those factions which continue our shame and

grief to this day. Those that were ready to receive any Law from Christ by his Apostles, would never all agree in Humane pretended Universal Jurisdiction, nor in the Laws which such pretenders make: Mutable, Local and Temporary determinations of useful Circumstances, by their several Guides, suited to the time and place for Edification, they submit to. But Universal Law-makers they will never all acknowledge and own, And their Canons are swell'd to so great a bulk, and are so confounded with contradictions and uncertainties, that they are Racks and Engines to tear the Church (but utterly incapable of being the Rule of Unity and Universal Concord.)

§ 4. The thing which *Paul* feared hath been our Ruine. The Serpent which beguiled *Eve* (by pretence of advancement and greater knowledge) hath turned us from the simplicity that is in Christ. The primitive Unity is overthrown by departing from the primitive *Purity, Simplicity, and Love of all*. And they that will ever hope for Universal Concord, must endeavour the restoration of the Universal Terms and Temper. Nothing next to fleshly and worldly lusts, hath done so much to cut the Church into all the Sects which now remain as in a Religious War, as this same pretended Universal Jurisdiction, which our new Church-men mistake for the only cure: Which I have fully proved in my Breviate of the History of Bishops and Councils, and in the Vindication of it against the Accusations of Mr. *Morrice*.

§ 5. *Obj.* The Scripture giveth but general Rules, (*that all be done to edification, decently and in order*) but there must be Laws of Discipline to deter-

determine in *Specie* what is for edification, decency and order.

Ans. There are three sorts of these determinations: 1. Of things necessary or meet for all the Christian World to be obliged to: 2. Things meet for some Countreys to be obliged to: 3. Things variable, which Congregations may use variously, and also change as occasion changeth. It grieveth us to read how some Learned men that write on this Subject, abuse the World by confounding these.

The first Christ hath determined sufficiently in the Scripture, and no mortal men have any power to make Laws Ecclesiastical or Civil to bind all the World.

The second of these the King may determine by the Counsel of fit men who understand the case; *e. g.* what Translation of the Bible in the English Tongue is fittest to be commonly used in the Publick Churches. And if the King determine it not, the Pastors in Synods may do it by way of voluntary consent, but not as having as a Major Vote the Regiment of the Minor, and of the absent or dissenters.

The third belongeth to every Pastor over his own Flock, and may be altered as there is occasion; *viz.* At what hour to meet, how long to Pray and Preach, in what words, and variable methods; what person to admit to Baptism as fit, and to Church-Communion; and what individual to Reprove, Exhort, Catechize, Excommunicate, &c. A General or Provincial Council need not be called for any such thing as these.

§ 6. Saith Dr. *Beveridge*, *Proleg.* That which Right Reason gathers from Scripture is of God, for Right Reason is of God.

Ans. True: But to gather it as Governours of all the World, or of other mens charges (as if the Right Reason of the King of *France* would give Laws to the King of *England*;) is one thing; and to gather it by a discerning Judgement to teach our Flocks as Expositors, or to guide our own Practice, is another thing.

§ 7. The Instance which he addeth of the *Trina Immersio* in Baptism, sheweth that such things were never made Laws for the Universal Church; for the Church never used them universally, nor continued them, but quickly changed them.

§ 8. *Ibid.* Saith Dr. *Beveridge*, General Councils are those to which all the Bishops of the whole World were called: It's not necessary that they be all there, but that all be called, and may come, if they will. But the five Patriarchs must be there, or send their Letters. There was no General Council which was not called by the Emperors command.

Ans. 1. All the Bishops of the World were never called to any Council, nor near all. 2. What Authority had the Roman Emperors to call Bishops out of other Princes Dominions? 3. There is no Historical proof that ever they did any such thing. 4. The Subscriptions of the Councils shew that the Bishops were only out of the Roman Provinces (except some odd person, as *Joannes Persidis* at Nice, which no man can give account of.) 5. Half the Bishops of the Empire were not at the Councils. 6. If calling them make a Council General, though they come not, then calling a Congregation, though they come not, maketh it a Congregation: What if none come? What if few come? Who knoweth how many must come to make it a General Council?

§ 9. Against what I have proved against *Johnson* alias *Terret*, that Councils were General, but as to the *Orbis Romanus*, (as National) I never heard but one Objection regardable, and that is, out of *Tarrians* or *Pisanus* Arabick Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which place *Ethiopia* under *Alexandria*: But, 1. Dr. *Beveridge* and many others have told us how little credit is to be given to those Canons, lately vended by ignorant unlearned Men. And is it credible that all the Eastern and Western Churches should be ignorant of them?

2. *Ludolphus* in his new Ethiopick History labours to prove that, the first planting of Religion in *Habassia* was by *Fruementius* and *Edesius*, and that the old Writers mistook *Habassia* for *India*: And if so, *Habassia* could have no Bishop at *Nice* (and certainly had none there, nor any to be subject to *Alexandria*, save *Fruementius* whom *Athanasius* ordained, and so by a voluntary Submission depended on him, as a Child on his Father.

But whereas *Ludolphus* thinks Christianity was not in *Habassia* till *Fruementius* days, because they had no Bishops or Pastors before; I answer, 1. His Conjecture that it was *Habassia* that *Fruementius* went to, and is called *India*, is uncertain. 2. He confesseth the Ethiopick Tradition is that Christianity was there before. 3. And it is not improbable that both agree, viz. That the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* brought Christianity thither, but being a Lay man ordained no Pastors, and so they had none before *Fruementius*. 4. But whoever well considers the whole History of the Southern and Eastern Churches, may easily discern that *Habassia* was never subject before to the Imperial *Alexandria*, but began their subjection voluntarily to *Dioscorus*,

who *had been* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, after he was Banished.

§ 10. It is a dreadful Judgment of God that the Understandings of Learned men should be so far forsaken, as to make the *Major part* of the Christian World not only the *Pattern*, but the *Lam-givers* to the rest, renouncing hereby the common Experience of Mankind: It is God's great Mercy that all Christians agree in the Essentials of Christianity: else they were not Christians. In Christianity we are united to them all. But, 1. Even among the Heathens few were Philosophers; And among the Philosophers few sound, and few of one Mind; And others, as well as *Seneca* said, *A wise man must be content with few Approvers: The Multitude will not understand.* 2. Even Nature maketh but few Men of strong Wits. 3. Education giveth few Men the advantage of sound teaching, and great helps and leisure. 4. Few Men have patience to hold on in hard Studies till they digest the truth. 5. Few Men escape the snares of Temptations to byass them to some corrupt opinions or way. 6. Few Men escape the fleshly worldly inclination, which ever followeth worldly interest. 7. He would be thought no Wise Man himself, who would refer a Controversie about the Translation of a Hebrew or Greek Text, or a difficulty in Divinity, Philosophy, Astronomy, Criticism, &c. to the Major Vote of the University or Ministers of *England*, (or *Drs.* either;) *K. James* had more wit than to make the Majority of the Clergy the Judges of his Translation of the Bible. 8. We see among Godly Persons what various degrees of Knowledge and Virtue, and consequently different Opinions there be. 9. It's actually known that

that most of the Churches and Clergy in the World are very ignorant and erroneous: The *Abassines, Copties, Syrians, Armenians, Georgians, Circassians, Mengrelians, Greeks, Moscovites*, generally unlearned Ignorant men: The multitude of the Parish Priests among the Papists are so: And too many among the Protestants. If King *James* had not chosen Six extraordinary men for the Synod of *Dort*, there had been worse work there than was.

And must we condemn God's Law of Insufficiency to be the Universal Law, that we may come under the Universal Legislation of such men as these? Should we not rather pity and pray for the Ignorant erroneous Majority of Churches, and study how the few that are wiser, may help them into a clearer light?

And how should it be otherwise? who chooseth the Clergy? In a great Part of the Churches the Turk who is their Enemy chooseth them, or as bad: He receiveth into the Patriarchates of *Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem*, unlearned Fellows that give most Money, and they dare not displease him: And all the Bishops of his Dominions in the entrance and exercise of their Office accordingly are liable to corruption by servile dependance on the Infidels. In *Moscou* and other Countries ignorant and barbarous or tyrannical Rulers choose them. Among Papists and Protestants, the Pope and Princes choose the Bishops, and Lay-Patrons choose the Priests, for the most part.

§ 11. To Unite in Sin (as the necessary terms of Universal Concord) is foolish and sinful. But to Unite in all that is held by the greater part of

of Christians is to Unite in much Sin—Ergo—

§ 12. *It is only Universal Laws which are the Rule of necessary Universal Concord : But it is only Christ's own Laws (Proclaimed and Recorded by the Spirit in his Apostles and Evangelists) which are Universal Laws, Ergo it is only Christ's own Laws which are the Rule of necessary Universal Concord.*

I challenge all the Church Usurpers in the World to answer this Argument, better than by deceiving words.

The Major is grounded on the natural Notice of Mankind. It is *Duty* only which we speak of. *Duty* is made *Duty* by a Law, or Command of Authority : Universal *Duty* must be made such by an Universal Law.

The Minor is thus proved. *No Universal Law can be made but by a rightful Universal Law-maker. But there is no rightful Universal Law-maker but Christ : Ergo no Universal Law can be made but by Christ.*

The Major is undeniable. The Minor is thus proved.

1. None can be a rightful Universal Law-maker but such as hath a rightful *Universal Power of Government*, and that in *Sovereignty* : (For Legislation is the first and chief part of Sovereignty.) But none but Christ hath a rightful Universal Power of Government or Sovereignty. *Ergo—* Minor, None can be a rightful Universal Governor or Law-maker, to whom God never gave such Power : But God never gave such Power to any but Christ : *Ergo, &c.*

None can be a rightful Universal Law-giver and Governor who is naturally incapable of it : But all on Earth are naturally incapable of it. *Ergo, &c.*

If

If there be any rightful Universal Governor on Earth, it is either a Pope, or some Patriarchs, or a General Council, or the Pastors of all the Church on Earth diffused: But it's none of these Four (as I have oft proved, and am ashamed to repeat.)

Chap. 4. *The Deceits that are Pleaded for an Universal Humane Sovereignty.*

§ 1. **T**HE great means by which the Popish Clergy have been themselves deceived, and then deceived much of the Christian World, are especially these following.

I. By a false Notion of the *Unity* of the Catholick Church: As if it were *Unifed* by *One Humane Political Sovereignty* Monarchical or Aristocratical (Pope or Universal Council) which hath Power of Governing all Christians on Earth, by Universal Legislation and Judicature; and not only by Christ, who indeed is its only Universal Governor.

II. By extolling Monarchy as the best means of Unity; and so inferring the Papal Monarchy; so did *Carolus Boverius* to our late King *Charles* in *Spain*: As if Princes were so weak as not to distinguish a *National* and a *Universal* Monarchy? Let them try this Argument with any Papist King on Earth [*Monarchy is the best Government. Ergo there should be One Monarch of all the Earth, whose Subject you and all other Kings must be*] and see whether they will be so fooled into Subjection.

III. By dreaming of such a difference between
Civil

Civil Government and *Church Government*, that though no man in his wits pleads for one Humane King (or Senate) to Govern the whole Earth by the Sword; yet it is our Religion to be for and under One Sovereign Church Governour (Pope or Senate) of all the Earth: whereas he is unfit to Govern one Church, who knoweth not that It is more impossible for the whole Earth to be Governed by One Church Sovereign (Pope or Council) than by one King or Parliament by the Sword.

IV. By confounding the *Universal Roman Empire* and *Church*, and the *Universal World*, and dreaming that what is said of the first was said of the last: and when the Church is called Catholick or Universal, and Councils General, only as to the Roman Empire, they would perswade men that it's meant of all the World.

V. By pleading that Possession which Pope and Patriarchs, and Councils had in the Empire, as if it obliged the same Countries to them when they are fallen under other Princes. And by pleading to the same Ends all the Possession which Popes, or Patriarchs, or Councils have got by deceiving any Nations of the World.

VI. By mistaking the Nature and Extent of the Pastoral Office; because as every Christian, so every Pastor is related to the Universal Church, therefore they gather that there is one College or Council consisting of all Bishops in the World (the Pope being President) who as an Aristocracy must sovereignly Govern all the Christian World, by Legislation and Judgment: As if because Physicians are Licensed to Practice any where in the Land, as they are called, therefore, they might gather

gather into a General Council and Command all the Land to obey them as Law givers, in all Matters of Health and Physick ? and might invade the Hospitals at their pleasure? And so all the Churches and Church Affairs on Earth must be governed by Priests of Foreign Lands.

VII. By first mistaking, and then falsely claiming Apostolical Power : Because Christ chose a few whom he first personally taught his Will, and then endowed with the Gift of Infallibility, by his Spirit, to Preach first and Record after, his Doctrine and Laws, to oblige all the World ; therefore they pretend that ordinary Bishops who had no such Spirit, Office or Commission, may also make Laws to bind all the World. And when every single Apostle had this Office, Power and Spirit, but they yet a while lived together at *Jerusalem*, till their dispersion, they pretend that at *Jerusalem* they were a General Council, and that all Bishops therefore may Govern as a General Council : whereas the Apostles Mission was Indefinite, and not Universal, (else they had sinned in not going into all the World.) And it was easie to Guide the Universal Church, while it was almost all at *Jerusalem* or near them. And their Office as to Legislation differeth from common Pastors, as *Moses* the Legislator's did from the Priests, who were but to govern by his Laws, and not to make more.

VIII. By pretending a necessity of Judging and Ending Controversies, and therefore of having one deciding Judge or Judicature for all the World. As if any would be so mad as ever to expect that all Controversies about the Mysteries of Supernatural Revelation and the unseen World should be ended

ended in this Life : As if Ignorance would be without Errour. And is he a Man that knoweth not how little it is that the wisest know ? and how much Ignorance all Mankind is guilty of ? Have these Pretenders yet ended Controversies ? Are there not many Horse-Loads of Volumes of Controversies among themselves ? Have they yet written any Infallible or Determining Commentary on the Bible ? Did not St. Paul write, *Rom. 14. & 15, &c.* for bearing with tolerable Differences. Is it not the Great Wisdom and Mercy of God to lay mens Salvation upon a few plain things, though a multitude besides remain as Controversies. Christ will decide them all at the Great approaching Judgment : And is there any on Earth that can decide them all ? that hath either so great Knowledge, or so Universal a decisive Power ? Why is the Christian World these Thousand or Twelve hundred Years divided into Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Papists, Protestants, &c. if there be a Humane Judicature to End all Controversies ? And are such Popes as reigned from a Thousand to Fifteen hundred, and such Bishops as made up their Councils, (Men of Ignorance and Vice) fit to end all Controversies on Earth.

IX. In order to these Ends they make a great cry of the Sects and Divisions which are among Protestants, to draw men that love Unity to come for it to the Church of *Rome*.

And first they impudently falsifie the History of the Matter of Fact, and perswade Men that the Differences among Protestants are ten times greater than they are. They have thus pleaded it to my face when I had a Pastoral Charge at *Kiddersminster* : where we were all of one Religion and

lived

lived in love and Peace, and had not one separating Assembly in a great Town and Parish; And where to this day they live in Piety, Love and Peace, and I hear not of one person that for any difference, breaketh this bond of brotherly love, and liveth in any opposition to the rest. Yet Strangers are told, that we are mad in religious Sects and Strife. Indeed zealous people that account all the Matters of the World, but trifles in Comparison of things everlasting, do make a greater Matter of them, than men of no Religion do. If among them one or two turn to any dangerous Sect or Course, it stirs up much censure and opposition, when in undisciplined Churches corrupted like the common World, multitudes in a Parish may abstain from Sacraments, and in Coffee-Houses or at Visits familiarly talk against the Immortality of the Soul, and against the Scripture and all serious Religion, and it maketh no great noise. An Act of Fornication once in many Years among chaste religious persons, is a Scandal scarce ever to be expiated; when among known Stews it's little talk of. Weeds are not suffered in a Garden: But in the Commons who pulls them up? And what wonder if they strive most about Religion who value it most? Dogs will fight for Bones and Carrion, and Swine for Draff: But Men will sooner fight for Gold and Pearls, while Dogs and Swine like peaceable Creatures pass them by, or tread them in the Dirt.

All true Christians are agreed in all that God hath made necessary to Christianity and Salvation: And no men on Earth were ever so wise, as to be agreed of the meaning of every word besides in the Bible: Much less in all that Usurping Universal Legislators will obtrude.

What

What a dismal noise and dangerous rupture doth the Controversie make now about Conformity in *Brittain*? And what is our difference? We are all agreed, 1. That there is only one God, the Governour of all the World, and of his Attributes. 2. That Man's Soul is immortal, and that he hath another life after this ~~to~~ live, and Heaven or Hell must be his end. 3. That Jesus Christ God and Man, is the only Saviour, and Lord of all. 4. That the Law of God is the chief indispensable *Rule* of our Faith and Life, by which we must be judged. 5. That we must live soberly, righteously and godly, loving God above all, and our neighbours as our selves, and doing as we would be done by, superiours Ruling for God, and inferiours obeying them under God; but none having power above him or against him. 6. That God only is the final Infallible Universal Judge of Controversies: That Magistrates are Judges who shall be punished or protected by the Sword. And Pastors are Judges who is fit for Communion in the Churches under their over-sight: And every man a discerning rational Judge of his own duty. 7. That without holiness, righteousness and temperance, (or mortifying the lusts of the flesh by the Spirit) no man can be saved. 8. That no man should sin wilfully for any price, or to avoid any danger even of death. 9. That the Soul should be more cared for than the Body. 10. That no man can love God and Holiness too much, nor obey him too faithfully. 11. That we should delight in the Law of the Lord (and his Gospel) and meditate in it day and night. 12. That serious, fervent and faithful prayer is our daily ordinary duty. 13. That we should live as we would

would be judged, and daily prepare for death, that we may be found ready. 14. That we should use all worldly temporal things for spiritual everlasting ends, knowing that else they are but vanity, vexation and dangerous snares. 15. That we should fetch our joy from the hopes of Heaven more than from all the possessions, pleasures and hopes on Earth.

These, and abundance more, we are commonly as to Profession agreed on : And though this in sincerity will serve for our acceptance with God and our Salvation, it will not serve for our acceptance or toleration with some men, nor to avoid the cry of scandalous, intolerable Schism, Disobedience, Obstinacy, and what men mind to charge upon us : Yea, though we are agreed that Rulers in their several places must be obeyed in all things that are not against the Law of God in Nature or Scripture.

But what now is the difference, I will add that if every Conformist and Nonconformist in *England* were of so (unattainable) perfect knowledge as to be agreed of the sence of every Syllable in the Bible, it would not serve to end our Differences, nor keep us from Prisons, Silencing, and the present heavy Accusations.

Wonder not at it : It's an evident Truth. Our Difference is, 1. About the meaning of some Oaths, Declarations, and subscribed Professions and Promises imposed by Acts of Parliament. 2. About the meaning of several Rubricks and other Words in the Liturgy and Book of Ordination. 3. About the meaning and practice of several Canons.

Gods Law hath agreed us all that Lying deliberately

rately is a sin, and so is Perjury, especially of thousands, and so is the wilful depraving of Baptism and other Ordinances of God, and so is the unjust Excommunicating of the Faithful, and denying them Baptism and the Lords Supper, and so is Sacrilege, and Renouncing the Sacred Ministry when we are Vowed to it ; and so is Schismatical Dividing Christs Church by needless and unlawful Snares and Engines. All these we are agreed are heinous sins, not to be done for any Price. But we are utterly disagreed whether to Conform would make us guilty of these sins. But what! Are Learned men such miserable Casuists as not to know what Lying, Perjury, Sacrilege, Profaning Baptism, Sinful Excommunicating, &c. are? We differ about the *sence of the Words Imposed*, and of the *Law and Canons*: And then how should we know who is the Sinner?

But Qu. Who is it that wresteth them from their usual signification? And who is it that dare not do it?

But the Sacred part of the Imposers cry up the necessity of a Judge of Controversies, (yea an Universal Judge, some of them,) to Expound the Scriptures when men differ about the sence; and will not they procure you an Exposition of a few controverted sentences in the Laws, or endeavour it, if that be necessary to understand or end your Differences? *Ans.* No; whatever cometh of it, to Bodies or Souls, to Church or Kingdom, these Expositors of Scripture and Enders of Controversies will not so much as Perition the Law-makers to explain their words. Yea though the Conformists are much disagreed about it among themselves. Judges will decide particular Causes by

by the Law : But to know the sence of the Law antecedently as our Rule, which is required in one that Sweareth and Subscribeth to it, can be by no ones Exposition but the makers of the Law. Else the Judges were the only Law-makers: For the sence is the Law : And he maketh the Law that maketh the sence, and not they that make the words alone, which other men must put the sence on.

And if Popes, or Councils, Prelates or Priests, could on pretence of a Judicial Expository Authority be Judges to all the Earth in what sence every word of Scripture must be understood, it is they and not God that make the Law: For God made but the words, if this be true, and the Bishops make the sence by pretence of judging of it. To give an Universal Antecedent Obligatory Exposition, is an Act of Legislation, and none but the Law-maker himself can do it. But to judge by this Law who shall be received, and who shut out of their several Churches, the Pastors must do that.

X. Another great deceit is, by confounding *Communion and Concord*, with *Government and Subjection*: And arguing that because all Christians must have Concord and Communion, therefore they must be under one Supreme Humane Government: As if Christian Princes were not as much bound to Concord as any men on Earth? Or as if that Concord must be kept by one Supreme Universal Senate or Monarch, and mutual Consultation and voluntary Agreement would not serve.

Obj. But if God bind us to do all things in Concord, and General Councils and Patriarchs determine the matter of our Concord, it comes all to one, in point of Obligation?

G g 2

Ans.

Ans. 1. If it come all to one in the effect, why do you contend for so much more in the Cause?

2. God bindeth Princes and States as much to Concord, and yet their voluntary Treaties and Dyets, and a Supreme Government over them, do not come all to one.

3. God doth not bind all Churches or Christians to agree in more than he himself hath commanded them. And therefore hath given power to none on Earth, to determine what more all shall agree in.

4. The Greater the Councils are *ceteris paribus* the more all Protestants reverence them, because they signifie the Concord of many: But, 1. We know that there are none of them Universal as to the World, nor ever are like to be. 2. We know that the Greater part are usually the worst; and that at this day the far greater number of Christians on Earth (Papists, Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, &c.) are lamentably degenerate, ignorant and corrupt. 3. And we know that as God hath not made the greater number the Governors of the lesser, so neither doth he bind or allow the less to consent to them to their hurt. 4. And when Councils for meer Agreement, will degenerate, and Usurp a Regiment over Dissenters, they change their Species, and bind us not to obey them, but oppose them as Usurpers.

XI. The last deceit that I shall here name is, Their pretence of the mischief of letting Sinful or Heretical Kingdoms go unpunished, when singular Persons must not escape: Therefore there must be a Supreme Power on Earth to correct or punish National Churches or Kingdoms.

You

You may find the Argument in *Dr. Samuel*,
(*Bishop Gunning's* Chaplain, and Master of a Col-
lege in *Cambridge*) and many others.

This is so plain dealing that one would think all
Kings and Kingdoms should easily understand
it.

But I answer it. 1. Why will this pretended
necessity of correcting Kings and Kingdoms infer
One Universal Church Sovereign any more than
one King or Senate over all the Earth?

Perhaps you'll say, The Church is one, but
Kingdoms are many. I answer, The whole World
on Earth is One Kingdom of God, but particular
Churches are many.

2. Kings and whole Kingdoms shall be punish-
ed as well as singular Persons: But only by God
the Universal King; or by permitted Enemies,
but not by any Humane Superior Governors.
Kings are under the Laws of God and they shall
be judged by those Laws: If you lived in the due
expectation of Death and Judgment, you would
not think them insignificant words, that the Just
Universal Judge is as at the Door, who only can
Judge Kings.

3. The Ministers of Christ who know them,
and live under them, have sufficient Authority
to admonish Kings and Kingdoms, and exercise
Pastoral Care of their Souls, by Preaching and
Applying the Word of God; as their own Physi-
cians are fittest to take care of their Health, with-
out sending to *Rome*, or over all the Earth for a
Council of Physicians. What work these Uni-
versal Rulers have made by Excommunicating
Kings and Interdicting Kingdoms, History ac-
quainteth us: It hath not been such as should

make any Man long for an Universal Church Governour of Kings and Kingdoms.

4. Those Foreigners that think Kings and Kingdoms Heretical, and prove it, may renounce Communion with them without pretending to be their Governors.

I have thought meet here briefly to repeat our Controversie, with the Reasons and Deceits of the Usurpers; our own Judgment is for true Catholicism, even one Catholick Head, Jesus Christ, one Catholick Church having no other Head or Sovereign, One Spirit, One Faith, One Baptism, One Hope of Glory, and One God and Father of all: And that all Christians should live in Love to others as themselves, and in their several Churches under the just conduct of their several Pastors, *keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, Eph. 4. 3. That they should all know those that labour among them, and are over them in the Lord, and highly esteem them in love for their work sake, and be at peace among themselves, 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. That the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteousness and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost: And he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God and approved of men, (who judge as God would have them judge.) Rom. 14. 17. But if God be forsaking the West, as far as he hath done the East, and clementation prognosticate perdition, the Kingdom above shall never be forsaken. And we look for a new Heaven and a new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness. And seeing all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of Persons ought we to be in all holy Conversation and Godliness, looking for and hasting to the Coming of the day of God? 2 Pet. 3. 11, 12.*

Chap. V. *What a Foreign Jurisdiction by Councils or the College of Bishops is, the Mask being taken off.*

Methinks Princes and States, and Churches, should not be cheated into a state of Subjection without ever considering or examining what it is : And methinks no honest Bishops should be unwilling that it be truly understood.

I. Consider what an Universal Legislative Power includeth. It plainly implyeth the insufficiency of Gods Words and Laws to those Ends for which this power is pretended. Whereas this is the very point of the Protestant Cause as differenced from Popery, that God being the only Ruler of the whole World none else can make Laws for the whole, but only such By Laws for their particular Provinces (as Corporations do under the King) for undetermined Circumstances, in which Kingdoms and Churches may freely differ.

II. By this the Peace of the Christian World will be laid on these variable Circumstances : As if all the World were bound to wear such Garments as *France* or *England* wear, &c.

III. By this the Legislative Power of every Kingdom is taken away in all matters of Religion (which are our greatest things :) For it is the *summa potestas* only that hath the Legislative Power : At least no Inferior hath any but from and under the Supreme ; nor may contradict them. VVhereas even the Decrees of our National

Clergy are no Laws with us, till the King shall make them Laws.

IV. By this no Man can tell what degree of Power these Foreigners will assume : As the Popes Ecclesiastical Power is now extended to Testaments, Matrimony, Adulteries, Church Lands, &c. Among Christians to whom all things are sanctified, they may challenge almost all. And when it becomes a Controversie who shall judge? Certainly the Supreme Power is the Supreme Judge of their own Rights.

V. I think it will oblige Kings, Lords and all, when Summoned to Travel out of their own Kingdoms as Malefactors to answer what accusations are brought against them. For certainly a Supreme Judicature must have its *Forum*, where men must be heard before they are Judged, and where all that are Summoned must answer. Or else Kings and Kingdoms must become poor Subjects to any Fellow that the Foreign Sovereign will make his Chancellor or Legate.

VI. VVho knoweth not how much the Government and Peace of the State will depend on the Government of such an Universal Church Governor? VVhen they have Excommunicated the King, will not the Subjects the more dishonour him, if they take the Excommunicators Power to be Supreme? What work hath the Pope made by Excommunications? Kingdoms have been engaged in War by it against each other? Yea Subjects against their Kings? Yea Sons have deposed their Fathers, as the Emperor *Henry's* Case acquaints us. Yea when the Pope hath not medled, Bishops Councils have basely deposed the best of Kings, as *Ludov. Fin* Case tells us, and the Em-
pres

press *Maud's* in *England, &c.* In ad ordine *Spiritualia* all will fall into the Foreign Sovereigns hands. They must be the Soul, and Kings but the Body.

VII. It will unavoidably follow that Kings and Kingdoms must be subjected to Foreign Princes by this pretence of a Foreign Church Jurisdiction. For he knoweth little of the World that knoweth not that to be true which *Dr. Peter Heylin* (on the Creed; of the Cath. Church) citeth out of *Socrates*, that since Emperors were Christians all things depended on their beck or will: Will not they chuse Bishops or Rule in the choice? Will not they over-rule the choice of such as are to be sent to General Councils; as King *James* chose the Six that went hence to *Dort*? Is it not known that it is the Excellency and Merit of our Clergy to be obedient to the Kings Will? And is it not so in the rest of the VWorld? Therefore those Princes that can command the greatest number of Bishops, will be Governors of all the rest of the VWorld, both over their Souls and Bodies.

VIII. I desire it may be well considered whether the Government of all Kings, for Soul and Body, will not fall into the hands of Mahometans and Infidels, or at least the contest prove hard between them and the Papists. For it is no small number of Bishops that are in the Mahometans Dominions? Turks, Moors, Persians, Indians, &c. And if they know once the advantage of numbers they can make more when they will: Even one to every Christian Congregation. And as *Ludolphus* tells us of the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, that any ignorant sorry Fellow gets the place, that can purchase it by Favour and Money of the Turks,

Turks, so it is at *Constantinople* as to the over-ruling of the Choice.

But that's not the worst: But by our Subjecters Principles the five Patriarchs have such a Power in Councils, that it's no Council without them, or the greater part of them. And four of the five Patriarchs are Subjects of the Turk, and the Pope is the fifth or first). And will not the Turk then choose them, and so be Master of our Religion, and of all the Christian World? Or if the Pope get the greater Number of Bishops the Matter will not be well amended; as the *Trent* Council hath assured us.

And when the Empire was over the West, the Emperor had a chief hand in choosing Popes: And who knows how soon it may be so again, and the new way of Cardinals be cast by? And so we shall be the Emperor's Subjects.

IX. We know already that the far greatest part of the Bishops of the World are lamentably Ignorant and Erroneous Men, and keep up Error and Divisions in their several Countries, viz. in *Greece, Moscovie, Armenia, Syria, Abassia, &c.* and in *Italy, Spain, Poland, Hungary, Germany, &c.* And are we bound to obey them because they are the greater number? In Council or out of Council they are the same men. What Nation under Heaven hath Bishops just of the Mind of these with us in *England*? or so sound and judicious as ours have been, and some yet are? And must our English Bishops give up their Judgments to an erroneous Majority abroad? Is that our thankfulness to God?

X. How little difference is it to us, whether
e. g. Image-worship, Transubstantiation or any Sin

Sin be commanded us by a Council, or by the Pope? or by him as Absolute or as Patriarch of the West, and *Principium Unitatis*?

XI. What can a *Principium Unitatis* signifie in the Universal Church, but some Governing Power and Unifying Prerogative? Who but the King can be *Principium Unitatis* in the Kingdom? The Question will not be whether the Pope shall be the Universal Monarch, but only whether this Monarch's Power be Absolute and Total, or Limited and Partial with his Council. And Church-Monarchs that have these Thousand Years conquered Church-Parliaments already may do so still.

XII. If the Pope have not the Universal Supreme Government in the Intervals of Councils there will be none. And if there have been none these Thousand Years (which must follow their Opinion that end it as the Sixth Council) why should it be new made now?

XIII. We know already that *Grotius* and his Party are for the Popes Government in chief in the Intervals of Councils; but not Arbitrarily, but by the Canons. And I have after named you a multitude of Canons already, which we cannot lawfully obey.

XIV. It will make an endless Controversie in the World, what Councils shall be approved and obeyed, and which not.

XV. If the Pope must preside, he will have it near him: He will not Travel to *Syria* or *Armenia*, &c. but they must come to him: And wherever the Council is called, the nearest Bishops will carry it by numbers against the remote, who will be few.

XVI. None can expect that the Pope as Patriarch

patriarch and *Principium Unitatis*, will do his part for nothing: And the riches of this Kingdom is little enough for the King, Clergy, and People. We cannot spare that which Foreigners will expect (and have done in this Land).

XVII. While the same Man that is here owned as Patriarch and *Principium Unitatis*, is owned as of greater Power in *Italy, Spain, Germany*, and other Lands, he will be strengthened to bring us to Conformity with the rest; and in time to obtain all his claim.

XVIII. Are Strangers like to be fitter Judges of the Matters of *England, Armenia, Habassia, &c.* than the Rulers & Clergy of the several Kingdoms, who know the Persons they must Judge, and can hear both sides speak, and examine Witnesses? &c.

XIX. The old and famous General Councils were not called to Govern Foreigners and all the World, but only the Empire that called them: And why should the Church Government now be any other, than Collateral with the Civil.

XX. I again and again say, that we are Sworn by the Oath of Supremacy against all Foreign Jurisdiction. And by the Corporation Act, the Vestry Act, the Act of Uniformity, the Militia Act, and the *Oxford Oath*, the Church and Kingdom is most solemnly bound, never to endeavour any Alteration of Government in Church or State: And if subjecting King, Kingdom, and Church to a Foreign Jurisdiction, of such as pretend to an Universal Supreme Legislative and Judicial Power, be not an Alteration of the Government of Church and State, I know not what is: Nor what is National Perjury if the National Endeavour or Consent to such Subjection be not such.

Add

Add to all this the unavoidable effects of this Opinion of the Universal Sovereignty, viz. 1. It engageth the Owners of it to condemn all the Protestant Churches, because they own no Universal Sovereign, nor the Pope as Patriarch or *Principium Unitatis* : yea, and to disown almost all the Churches of the World besides the Papists, as Schismatical.

2. They must Condemn all the Protestant Martyrs who rejected the Pope absolutely, as dying for Rebellion.

3. They must needs censure their own Princes and States as Rebels, who subject not themselves to this Usurped Sovereignty.

4. They will pervert all the Scriptures for Unity, and Peace, and Obedience, and interpret it, as meaning this Usurpation.

5. They will think it their Duty to use their best Endeavour to subject all Men to the Usurpers.

6. They will lose their due Charity to all that Consent not to this Subjection, taking them for Enemies to the Churches Unity and Peace, and Rebels against this Sovereign Power.

7. No wonder if such become grievous Persecutors, and stir up Princes and Rulers against such Christians as Schismatics and Enemies of Peace; And as Dr. Saywell and Bishop Gunning tell the World, that the meeting of such in worshipping God are the Conventicles of Schismatics, and the Cause of all our Plots and Divisions. And if *Obedience to this Universal Sovereignty* be (as they say) the only Cure of Schism, they must hold all our Parish Assemblies too to be Schismatical Conventicles, whose Pastors own not the Usurpation.

8. Thus as the Pope hath been the grand Divider of the Christian World, by setting up a false Head

Head of Union, so will these Men destroy all Unity *quamm in se* by setting up a Usurped Sovereignty, and a false *Principium Unitatis*; and will be the grand Schismatics to cure Schism.

9. They will by a false uncertain Universal Law-making, not only make Christ's Laws insufficient, but make Christianity a mutable, growing, uncertain thing; when no man shall be able to know which are the Church Laws, and when the Volumes of them will be perfected, and no more added.

10. When the Churches are thus Divided and Persecuted, and sound Preachers Silenced, the Persecutors will be hardened in impenitency, fathering all their Mischiefs on Christ which they do against him, and making Christian Fidelity odious as Rebellion and Schism.

And they will never be able in their way, so much as to satisfy impartial men, how true Bishops may be known, and who *ad esse* must be the Choosers of them; much less prove their Universal Sovereignty.

Chap. VI. *The Grand Consequential Case, Whether it be lawful for the Presbyters to swear Obedience to those Bishops, who profess Subjection to the Foreign Jurisdiction of a Universal Sovereignty? or for the People to live in Obedience and Communion with the Presbyters that do so?*

s. 1. **I** Wish this Case about such Subjection and Communion may never make the second breach

breach between Conformists and Nonconformists, much wider than the first is made.

I. Suppose the French Bishops will abate Idolatry, Owing Transubstantiation, Adoration of the Host, and of Saints and Images, Latin Service, will allow the Cup in the Sacrament, Priests Marriage, leave indifferent all other things that are not above Four hundred Years old, *Qu.* Whether is it lawful for the Protestant Ministers and all the rest to Swear Obedience to these Bishops, and to the Protestant Laity and all others to joyn in their Communion?

II. Suppose Archbishop *Bromhall* profess subjection to General Councils called and moderated by the Pope as President, and to the Pope as *Principium unitatis Universalis* and Patriarch of the West; Or the Bishop of *Eli* profess subjection to a Foreign Universal Jurisdiction, Is it lawful for the Bishops to Swear Obedience to that Archbishop, or the Presbyters to such a Bishop, and for the People to be subject to such Presbyters in Communion?

III. Suppose such Bishops would abate the Presbyters (a while till they are strengthened) the Oath or Promise of Obedience, is it lawful to receive Ordination from such Bishops, and live in subjection to them and Communion?

§ 2. The Case is of great moment, and very tenderly and warily to be handled.

I. On one side, If no Promise or Oath be required, nor any practice in it self unlawful, many will think it hard that they must separate from a whole Nation or Diocess for another man's Sin, which they consent not to? specially if it will cast them out of their Ministry and Maintenance.

They

They will think, his guilt lyeth only on himself. Else one man may over-turn the Liberties of a whole Diocess or Land by his own proper sin.

II. Yea if the Oath or Promise be put on them for Obedience but *in licitis & honestis*, they will think the case doth little differ; as long as they consent not to a Forreign Jurisdiction.

§ 3. On the other side, If all men must or may obey them that profess Obedience to a Foreign Universal Jurisdiction, may not one or two, or a few Bishops subject the Kingdom to Foreigners at their pleasure? And that the more dangerously, because without any noise or notable alteration, and so without resistance? It is but the Primate or Archbishops, or Bishops, professing subjection to the Pope or Foreign Sovereign, and the thing is done. The Bishops being subject to the Pope, or other Usurpers, and the Priests to the Bishops, and the People to the Priests, are they not all then subject to the Foreign Usurper?

If the Kings Army in the days of *H. 5. or Ed. 3. in France*, were to be hired over to the King of *France*, what need he more than that the General or Field Officers Swear fidelity to him? And that the Captains be subject to the Colonels, and the common Soldiers to them?

When the Kingdom was in continual War between King *Stephen* and *Maud* the Empress, and between the Houses of *York* and *Lancaster*, the people were not usually Sworn on either side: But the Bishops and the Barons did Swear and Unswear, and Forswear, and Change sides as their Interests led them, and this was the misery of the Land.

§ 4. And yet the Case would be much easier if only

only t
self to
publi
legian

§ 5.
guish,
of a P
the La
Church
Land v
volt.

2. I
subject
that is

3. I
and on

4. I
Right

5. I
as a C

6. E
as the

7. I
Church
truder

8. E
no bet
where

§ 6.
dreadf

I. I
on be
to him

II. I
fer, it's

only the King *e. g.* of *France* should subject himself to Foreigners, and forbid all to preach and publickly Worship God that will not Swear Allegiance to him, and obey him as their King.

§ 5. In these dreadful cases, we must distinguish, 1. Between such a Bishop as is a Member of a Protestant Nation, and who turneth against the Law of the Land and the Consent of other Churches, and such as would draw the whole Land with him, or is but one in a common Revolt.

2. Between a Minister who was Ordained and subject to the Bishop before he revolted, and one that is Ordained and subjected to him after.

3. Between a Bishop whose revolt is professed; and one that denieth it, or keeps it secret.

4. Between living peaceably, and owning the Right of the Bishops Authority.

5. Between obeying him as a Magistrate and as a Church Pastor.

6. Between obeying him as a meer Bishop, and as the Subject of a Foreign Power.

7. Between obeying such a one when the Church accepteth him, or when he is but an intruder against their consent.

8. Between subjection in necessary cases where no better can be had, and in cases unnecessary where we may have better.

§ 6. And I shall speak my thoughts as in a dreadful case in these Conclusions.

I. If the Bishops revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction be unknown, it maketh not that Obedience to him unlawful which was his due.

II. If a few Bishops revolt to a Foreign Usurper, it's easie to see that no one should follow them

He

against

against the contrary judgment of all the rest in the Nation, and so forsake the National Concord.

III. If one or more Bishops be known to revolt to a Foreign Sovereign, a Minister is not bound therefore to renounce Communion with all the Christians or Churches in his Diocese, who are innocent: No nor with all that renounce not Communion with him: For we know not whether they know his case, and have had means to understand and do their Duty.

IV. So far as a Bishop exerciseth the Power of the Sword as an Officer of the King, we must obey him though he be a Papist; in all things which he hath true power to command.

V. One that was Ordained by him before his revolt, may go on with his work and live peaceably, and not openly renounce the revolting Bishop, till he have a particular Call, for the Churches safety or the preservation of his own innocency.

VI. If a man be necessitated to live where no other Ministry or Christian Communion can be had, one that renounceth the Bishops Subjection to an Universal Usurper, may yet be subject to him, and receive Baptism from him, or administer it and other Ordinances of God in his Diocese, and acknowledge his Office so far as it is described by Christ, and conveyed by just means, and hath the consent of the Church.

A man may have two Commissions to one Office, of which one is currant and the other null: If one that hath Christs Commission, shall also take one from a Forreign Usurper, the latter is void, and the taking of it is his heinous sin; but it doth not nullifie all his Administrations to the Church;

Church; because his better Commission may so far stand good, as that his Baptizing, Ordination, and other Administration of Gods own Ordinances shall not be null. And therefore we use not to Rebaptize such as Papists Baptize, nor Reordain all that they ordain to the Ministry in general.

VII. But it is rather a Duty to forbear all Church Assemblies where no other can be had, than to profess consent to a Foreign Usurpation, or pretended Universal Sovereignty. For no sin must be done on pretence of necessity, nothing being indeed necessary which must be got by sinful means.

VIII. If a Nation (as *France*) be subject to the Usurpers of an Universal Sovereignty, or if a Nation shew themselves to be designing such a Subjection, or if one Bishop or more declare themselves for it, It is the Duty of Ministers openly to disown and oppose such attempts, and ordinarily to disown the proper Church Government, Ordinations and Communion of such Bishops: And it is the peoples Duty to disown the Pastoral Conduct of such Ministers as openly follow them.

For, 1. The design of this Universal Usurpation is Treason against Christ, by setting up men to possess his Prerogative, and pretend to be his Vicars or Chief Substitutes without his Commission: And it is a design to divide all the Churches by false means of Union; and so to cast them all into that miserable War which the Romanists these Thousand years have done: And consequently to introduce an intolerable corruption of Discipline and Worship, Doctrine and Life. And

no man may lawfully join in so wicked a design; nor be so much as neutral: If with single Fornicators, Railers, Drunkards, &c. we may not eat in familiarity, much less with such Subverters of the Christian World.

2. And no Christian is actually a Church-member under any one as his Pastor, without mutual Consent: And it is not lawful to consent to take a Traytor against Christ and the Church for our Pastor: He that is no Pastor should not be taken for a Pastor: But if he either want any *Essential Qualification*, (as to be *Christs Minister for the Churches good*,) or the Consent of the Flock he is no Pastor to them.

3. The resolution of the Case against *Martial* and *Basilides* by the *Carthage Council* with *Cyprian*, fully decideth the Case; proving by Scripture and Reason if the people forsake not an incapable Bishop, though other Bishops are for them, they greatly sin against God: And those that were but *Libellaticks*, came far short of the guilt of the Universal Usurpation.

4. And it is not the danger of suffering that will justify Subjection to such Designers: For suffering must not seem intolerable to Believers: None are true Christians but dispositive Martyrs.

5. Many old Canons were made against Presbyters Swearing or Promising Obedience to Bishops, as a thing dangerous to the Church; much more is it sinful to do it to such Church Enemies.

6. And Magistrates commands will not excuse it, because it is a thing forbidden of God, and which no Man hath right to command.

IX. The

IX. The restriction of [*in licitis & honestis*] maketh it not lawful to Swear or Promise Obedience to such. 1. Because even to subject our selves to Usurpers is not *licitum aut honestum* tho' they command nothing else but good. 2. A Lawful Ruler must be obeyed only [*in licitis & honestis*] And a Usurper must not be as much owned as a Lawful Ruler.

If an Usurper should set up in *England*, and should falsely pretend the Kings Commission, and should sollicite the Kings Army to take Commissions from him, a Loyal Subject might be deceived by him, believing that he had the Kings Commission when he had none: And might at once be true to the King in Heart, and do the things that Traytors do. But if he know that he hath none of the Kings Commission, but raiseth Arms against his Will and Law to strengthen himself, every Subject ought to renounce him, and to renounce the Commanders that follow him, and neither to Swear Obedience to them *in licitis & honestis*, nor yet to bear Arms under them. And this is as true of a Parliament or any Senate as of a single Usurper, should they falsely pretend that the King or Law doth make them the Governors of the Kingdom, and so Usurp the Kings proper Power? And specially if the Total Legislative and Judicial Supreme Power be absolutely in the King alone, as it is in God and Jesus Christ; which I add because some think they may lawfully be subject to those Bishops that are subjected only to Universal Councils or Church Parliaments to they do but disclaim the Roman Papacy.

X. Though some may think that subjection to

a pretended Universal Council may stand with Loyalty to Christ, because such a Council is a *Chimera*, or *Non Ens*, and never will be in the World, and so can do no harm, (as one may be true to the King, who yet Swearth Obedience to an Assembly of Mortal Angels,) yet the case is otherwise. For, 1. These Men that profess Subjection to Councils, cannot be supposed to take such Councils for *Chimera's* or things impossible, without being taken for mad Men. Therefore it is not a true General Council, but something possible that they mean: And they use to say themselves, [*or as General as can be well had.*] So that such a one as that at *Trent*, or as they will call General (as they do the old Imperial Councils) will serve their turn.

2. And let them disclaim Popery never so loudly, they mean still that the Pope must be the ordinary Caller and President of these Councils, and the Chief Patriarch and *Principium Unitatis Universalis*: And so all will come but to a limited Pope instead of an Absolute One? And is he not a Monarch though he must Rule by Law? For they intend not that there be no Catholick Church all the time that there are no Councils; and therefore they intend some Unifying, Constitutive, Executive Supreme.

XI. Obj. But if we may not own a Bishop that subjecteth himself to the Pope or other Foreign Usurper of Universal Government; then if the King be a Papist it will follow that we must not be subject to him: Which all Protestants confess to be false: Ergo, so is the Antecedent as of Bishops.

Ans. I deny the Consequence, speaking only of such a Kings Religion. Nero was a Heathen, and

and it was lawful for Christians to be subject to him, for Conscience sake: But it was not lawful to subject themselves to Heathen Bishops (a contradiction.) A Heathen may be Gods Minister to preserve the common Peace, and Execute the Laws of God in Nature, and the just Subordinate Laws: But the Office of a Bishop consisteth in another matter, *viz.* In teaching the true Doctrine and Laws of Christ; and guiding the Church by them, and keeping out all that is against them. And therefore no other man can be a Bishop that doth not this as to the Essentials. If the King command us to be Papists we must disobey him: But if he command us to do things good and lawful, we must obey: True Christianity is Essential to a Bishops Office, but not to a Kings, as King.

But if any put the Question, [*Whether a Ruler of a Protestant Kingdom, who taketh himself bound by the Laterane or other Council on pain of Damnation to destroy all his Kingdom that will not forsake their Religion, be Publicus Hostis? And whether by the Law of Nature every Nation have a right of self-defence against open Enemies?*] I meddle with no such Cases as these.

XII. To conclude, I advise all Christians to live peaceably in their places, but to take care whom they trust with the Pastoral Conduct of their Souls; and not to be seduced to enter into a Confederacy, against Christs Prerogative by any pretences of *Humane Authority*, or *Catholick Unity*, which really are against Divine Authority, and the true Unity of the Church in Christ: For a thousand years experience (even by our Bishops confession who own but the Six first Councils)

cils) have told us by the sad confusions of the Christian World, that such Pretenders to Unity in a Humane Universal Sovereignty have but *Caused divisions and offences contrary to the Apostolical Doctrine, not serving Christ, but their own bellies, and by good words and fair speeches deceived the hearts of the simple.*

Our Unity consisteth in One Head Jesus Christ, One God, one Body or Church of Christ, one Faith, one Baptism, one Hope, one Gospel and Universal Law of Christ; and that we live in Love, and Peace, and Order, in Learning and in Worshipping God in several Congregations under their respective Guides, as consenting Volunteers; and that the conjunction of such under Christian Kings, makes Christian Kingdoms; where by the Counsels of Pastors in their own Dominions, they may keep that Church-Peace and external Order, which is left to the trust of their determination; and that in cases of need, the Counsel and Help of Foreign Churches be desired; and that Communion in Christianity be professed with all the true Christian World; and that we wait for perfect Unity in Heaven. But that Princes and Kingdoms be not brought under a Foreign Jurisdiction, (specially if pretended Universal) instead of Foreign Counsel, Communion, Peace and Aid.

Chap. VII. *Of the second Part of the Design; to bring the Papists into our Communion, as they were in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.*

§ 1 **D**r. Heylin saith, That this was much of A. Bishop Land's design, and that it was
in

in order to this that he made the Changes which he made. And Dr. *Burnet* saith, That even Queen *Elizabeth* thought that if she could some how bring all her Subjects into one Communion, tho' of different Opinions, in one Age they would come to be of one mind : And therefore she was desirous to have kept up Images and other such things in the Churches, till the reasons and impportunity of some Divines prevailed with her.

§ 2. If this be done, it must be either by the Papists turning Protestants, or the Protestants turning Papists, or by meeting in some third State of Religion between both, or by continuing in the same Church-Communion without change of their Religion.

§ 3. I. If the Papists come into our Churches by Conversion, it is not then Papists but Protestants that come in. There is no true Protestant that is not earnestly desirous of this. But bare coming in to our Churches and Communion, is not a renunciation of Popery.

§ 4. II. That the Protestants should turn Papists for Union, is not openly pleaded for by them that we have to do with : The name of Papists they earnestly disown.

§ 5. III. If it must be by meeting in some middle way, it must be by a change in the Papists, or by a change in the Protestants, or both.

1. If the Papists change any thing of theirs, it must be either the *Essentials* of Popery, or also the grosser errors and sins which are its most corrupt Integral part, or only some mutable Accidents or lesser faults and errors.

1. If the Papists hold still that there ought to be one Universal Sovereign Power of Legislation and

and Judgment under Christ on Earth, and that either the Pope himself, with a General Council, or a Council where the Pope is President and *Principium Unitatis*, is this Sovereign, this is the Essence of Popery continued.

2. If the Papists should quit this Universal Sovereignty, and yet hold their other grossest Errours (as Transubstantiation, Image-Worship, Praying in an unknown Tongue, forbidding to read the Scripture translated, and such like) They would be still Hereticks, though not Papists.

3. But if they only retain some tolerable Errours, we should be willing to receive all such to our Communion.

2. If the change must be in the Protestants, what is it that they must change? If it be any Truth or Duty which they forsake, or any Sin which they must commit, they cannot honestly so change.

But if it be any Errours or Sins that we must forsake, that is a very desirable Change. Some men do ignorantly charge some Errours on the Papists which they are not guilty of; or lay the Errours of some few upon the most: Some make Errours which are but *de nomine* to seem to be *de re*: and lesser Errours seem great: Some take divers Truths to be Errour: And some are ready to call some lawful Customs of the Papists, by the name of Popery, and Antichristian: Some would deny Papists the common Civilities and Liberties which are their due. All such things as these we would have changed. And if altering any indifferent Practice of ours, would win them from their Errour to the Truth, we should so become all things to all men, to save some.

§ 6. IV. But if Papists must come to our Churches whilst Papists without any other Profession of a Change, 1. If it be but to hear Sermons, which Heathens may do, and if they voluntarily do it, I know few that will be against it. 2. But if it be to our Sacramental Communion, I have these Reasons following against it.

§ 7. I. Local Presence will make us really no more of one Church if different Religions make us incapable, than if we met at several places: Turks and Hereticks are not of our Church, if they should receive the Sacrament with us, if they renounce not their Infidelity and Heresie, if it be known.

II. The Bishops say now that the Conformists whose hearts are against Conformity, are more hurtful and dangerous to the Church than the Nonconformists, as using the publick Encouragements against them. How much more will Papists be more dangerous among us, than without our Churches?

III. It will be a Prophanation of God's Ordinance to give that Sacrament to an incapable person: And if they be forced against their will to Communicate, the Prophanation will be the greater: The Sacrament delivereth to the due Receiver a Sealed Pardon of all Sin, and a gift of Christ, and right to Salvation; And unwilling Persons are utterly incapable of these; willing consent even to the forsaking of all for it, being the condition.

IV. It must be gross hypocrisie and dissembling in the Papists to come to our Communion. They take Protestants for Hereticks, and Protestants take them for Hereticks; And their Doctrine is
against

against admitting Hereticks to Communion. They must hear with us their own Doctrines and Practices condemned; and they must hear ours asserted, which they abhor. And what Peace will this hypocrisie keep?

V. It will tempt the Preachers to give over Preaching against any of their Popish Errors, when they know how offensive it will prove to the Auditors: And so the Protestants also will be wronged?

VI. It will overthrow all serious true Church Discipline: when our Church Communion is crowded with men that hold the same Principles which Protestants take to be Heretical, and Treasonable against Christ, and practise what they call Idolatry, and are indeed of another Church, and under a Foreign Jurisdiction. How can our Church Governours censure, and cast out any others that be not greater Sinners than these men whom they would draw in? And what a Church will that be that taketh in all Sinners not worse than these?

VII. How will it look in the Eyes of God, and all just Men, that our Church should *ipso facto* Excommunicate all those Protestants, how Learned, Pious and Peaceable soever, that do but say that any thing in the Church Government, Liturgy, and Ceremonies is unlawful, according to the Can. 5, 6, 7, 8. and silence Protestants for scrupling Subscription or a Ceremony, at the same time offer Communion to all the Papists that will accept it and come in?

VIII. It will unavoidably cause a far greater Schism in the Church of *England* than hath yet been made: For it will drive out the best, if not the greatest part from its Communion: Can they think

think t
Papists
ches, y
nity, a
have d
thop A
Carlton
of such
charge
Dr. S
they c
that ex
IX.
or to
Church
stituti
tell th
great
and v
Church
over
we sh
shoul
X.
now,
one I
Conv
Whe
them
Fo
open
or by
done
fence
I am

think that such men will Communicate with the Papists, meerly because they come into our Churches, who have charged them with Antichristianity, and such a Mass of Heresies and Errours as have done Bishop *Downname*, Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Jewell*, Bishop *Carlton*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Willet*, and a multitude of such? Will they joyn with them that have charged them with Idolatry, as Dr. *Reignolds*, Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, &c. have done? What though they commit not Idolatry in our Churches, will that expiate the guilt of all the rest?

IX. Will this do more to Convert the Papists, or to Confirm them when they hold us to be no Church, they will not take themselves to be Constitutive Parts of the Church they come in. To tell them that all their Errours and Sins are no greater than are consistent with our Communion, and when we shall tell them that their Roman Church is a true Church, and we come so much over or nearer to them, sure they will rather look we should come one step further, than that they should come to us.

X. If we think it hard to keep out Popery now, how much harder will it be when they are one Body with us, and have the most familiar Conversation with us, and stand on equal terms. When masked and Church-Papists have served them most effectually.

For my part I fear no mans Censure, for my open profession, that I hate all Cruelty to Papists or by Papists; and that I would have nothing done to their hurt, unless our own necessary defence against their hurting us, will hurt them. And I am so far from desiring that they may be forced

to

to our Communion, either by the Writ de *Excommunicato Capiendo*, or any other way, that I would not give them the Sacrament if they voluntarily came to it, without profession of a change of their Understandings, Hearts, and Lives.

If the two Parts of the Design Conjoinct (1. Subjecting the Church and Kingdom to a Foreign Jurisdiction, 2. And opening our own Church Doors wide enough for the Papists, to come in, and be imbodyed in our Communion) be the way to Cure or keep out Popery, I confess I am mistaken in the way.

Chap. VIII *Why the Papists abating their Innovations of the last Four hundred Years, or keeping them to themselves, will not make a Coalition lawful, as Archbishop Bromhall thought.*

§ 1. **A**S to their keeping them to themselves and not imposing them on us, it leaveth them still as guilty of Rebellious, Heretical and Schismatical Doctrine as before: and as Antichristian in Usurping a Universal Sovereignty, or Legislative and Judicial Power: And therefore incapable of our Coalition, more than an Impenitent Murderer is of Church Communion.

§ 2. And there are not a few nor small Matters that are above Four hundred Years old that sound Protestants will never Unite with. And though Mr. Thorndike give us so much quarter as to say, that *It is the Authority that must necessarily be owned, and not the Canons if that Authority will change them,*

them; 1. It is the usurped Authority that we most disown. 2. And we have no assurance what Canons that Authority will change; And Mr. *Thorn-dike's*, Mr. *Dodwell's*, and such Mens great rule of Unity is, that none of us must question whether any of the Canons of that Authority are contrary to God's Word, nor appeal to God and Scripture against them. (Multitudes of Papists themselves renounce such Doctrine.)

§ 3. I. And first, All this is built on the Sand : I have largely proved long ago in several Books, that it is impossible for them to certifie us *who have this Authority* ? Who it is that we must hear as the Catholick Church, and take Universal Laws from, when there is no General Council ? Or what Councils we may be sure are General or what not ? (Besides none were General but of One Empire.) When they condemn each other : and when each call the other Heretical or Schismatical ? and when as Great a Number were at one as at the other ; and the same Authority chose and called both sorts ? How shall we know which we must obey ? Is it by Scripture, Reason or Authority of Councils themselves, that we must Judge ? They cannot tell us.

§ 4. II. (The Cause which I am pleading against is exprest by their Champion the Lord Primate of Ireland, Archbishop *Bromhall*, in the words forecited, *viz.* [*To wave their last Four hundred years Determinations is implicately to renounce all the necessary Causes of this great Schism : And to rest satisfied with their Old Patriarchal Power and Dignity, and Primacy of Order (which is another part of my Proposition) is to quit the Modern Papacy, both Name and Thing.*]

By

By this we see what the Protestant Church of *England* must be? or else be Schismaticks in the Judgment of these Learned Men.

I will here tell you why this will never Unite us, and why the old Church of English Protestants could not close with *Rome* on these mens terms.

§ 5. I. *Salmasius de Ecclesiis Suburbicariis circa finem* granteth them that by their Imperial Constitutions the Bishop of *Rome* was not a meer Patriarch, but more than a Patriarch, a *Caput Ecclesiae*: This was not Christ's Institution, but the Emperours and their Clergies in one Empire. But call it Patriarchal or what you will, it contained such Power as (Christ having not given and Dead men of another Kingdom being none of our Rulers) we are not obliged to obey; nor indeed lawfully can do.

I. A Patriarch and Primate hath some degree of Governing Power, or else wherein doth his Primacy consist? He calleth Councils, Precedeth, &c. And if he cannot command Archbishops, how can they command Bishops? And if they are not Commanders of Bishops, why do our English Bishops in their Consecration *Profess, Promise and Swear all due Obedience to the Archbishops*? And 1. We cannot yield to bring *England* under the guilt and brand of Perjury, by submitting to the Foreign Jurisdiction of a Roman Primate or Patriarch, contrary to the Oath of Supremacy. 2. We know already how many false Doctrines and Practices the Roman Church and Patriarch have espoused: And we can no more receive all these Errours from a Patriarch than from a Pope.

§ 6. II. But we will freely confess to you that

we

we neither are nor can be such a sort of Protestants as the Regnant Church of *France* is, which persecureth the Protestants, nor as these Men called the Church of *England* in such Proposals would have us be.

I will give you a Catalogue of some Determinations of above Four hundred Years old, which the Church of *England* before Bishop *Laud* could not receive.

§ 7. I. Mr. *Thorndike* also consenteth to rest in the Canons sent by Pope *Adrian* to *Carol*. M. about An. 773. And C. 23. ex *Clem.* is [*That Archbishop, Presbyter or Deacon taken in Fornication, Perjury or Theft, be deposed, but not Excommunicate.*]

II. Can. 28. is [*That a Bishop who obtaineth a Church by Secular Power be deposed.*] And yet we are called Schismatics for not obeying (alas, I dare not name the things) the Bishops that have many Score or Hundred Churches by Secular Power. And must we Unite in this?

III. Can. 11. is [*Condemned Clerks shall never be restored, if they go to the Emperour.*] And must we Confederate against such Bishops in *England*?

IV. C. *Laodic.* there recited 33. is that [*None Pray with Hereticks or Schismatics*]: When we knowing how the Roman Party are counted (at the best) Schismatics by Greeks, Syrians and Protestants, and all these counted Schismatics by them, it will be but Schism, to separate from almost all Christ's Church on Earth as Schismatics.

V. *Ex Can. Sard.* 2. [*That a Bishop that by Ambition, changeth his Seat, shall not have so much as Lay Communion, no not at the end.*

VI. *Ex C. Afric. c. 15.* That there be no Re-
ordaining or Translation of Bishops.

VII. No man must receive the witness of a Lay-
man against a Clergy-man.

VIII. The Second General Council at *Nice* set-
teth up the Adoration of Images, cursing all from
Christ with Anathema that are against it, or doubt
of it.

IX. Even the contrary Council at *Constantinople*
of 338 Bishops anathematizeth all that do not
with a sincere Faith craye the Intercession of the
Virgin *Mary* as the Parent of God and Superior
to every Creature visible and invisible. And all
that confess not that all who from the beginning
to this day, before the Law and under the Law,
and in the Grace given of God, being Saints, are
venerable in the Presence of God in Soul and
BODY, and seek not their Intercessions.

Yet they conclude with the Conc. *Nice 2.* That
Christ's Body Glorified is not proper Flesh, Def. 7.

X. The said Second Council at *Nice* saith [*Every
Election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon which is made
by Magistrates shall remain void, by the Canon which
saith [If any Bishop use the Secular Magistrate to ob-
tain by them a Church, let him be deposed and separa-
ted, and all that Communicate with him.]*

Thus our English Bishops and Parish Ministers
are deposed, and all their Communicants to be
Excommunicated.

XI. *Ibid.* Can. 4. Those that for Gain or Affe-
ction of their own shut out any Ministers, or shut
the Temples, forbidding the Divine Ministry, are
sharply condemned (which would fall on Silen-
cing Bishops).

XII. Can. 15. Forbiddeth one man to have two
Churches

Churches, which would break our Clergy, specially the Bishops that have Hundreds.

XIII. Can. 7. Forbiddeth any Temple to be Consecrated without Relicks, and ordereth Temples that have no Relicks to be put down.

XIV. A Council of Bishops in *France* depose the best of Kings, *Ludov. Pius.*

XV. Another Council at *Aquisgrane* deposeth *Lotharius.*

XVI. *Theodora's* Council at *Constantinople* is again for Images.

XVII. They so far deceived Kings, that *Carolus Calvus* in a Council at *Tullum* saith, That no man may depose him without the hearing and judgment of the Bishops, who are called the Throne of God, by whom God decreeth Judgment, and to whom he subjecteth himself.

XVIII. *An. 868.* In a Council at *Rome* under *Haarian* 2d. to detect the Thieves in Monasteries they are to be made receive Christ's Body and Blood.

XIX. *An. 869.* The *Constantinople* Council called by the Papists the 4th, and the 8th General one, C. 3. Curseth those that think Images are not to be Worshipped with the same honour as the Gospel, as teaching by colours what the Scripture doth by words,] saying, [They shall not see Christ's face at his second coming that adore not his Image.

Yet C. 8. They depose Bishops that made men Swear to be true to them. (And so our Bishops must be deposed for the Oath of Obedience to them.)

XX. The C. 11. is that [All Bishops bearing by Earth the Person and Form of the Celestial

Hierarchy shall with all Veneration be worshipped by all Princes and Subjects ; And shall not go far from Church to meet any Commanders or Nobles; Nor shall light from their Horses like Supplicants or Abjects that feared them ; nor fall down and Petition them : Else the Bishop shall be separated a Year from the Sacrament , and the Princes, Dukes or Captains two Years.] Is this like the Law of Christ ? Are all Princes under it ?

XXI. C. 12. Princes as Prophane may not be Spectators of that which Holy Persons do : and therefore Councils are held without them.

(Who would think that our Bishops or Priests could subscribe to these , and to the 39 Articles, and the Oath of Supremacy also ?)

XXII. Can. 14. saith, [That a Lay-man shall have no Power to Dispute by any reason of Ecclesiastical Sanctions,—For though a Lay-man excel in the praise of Piety and Wisdom, yet he is a Lay-man and a Sheep, and not a Pastor : But a Bishop, though it be Manifest that he is destitute of ALL VIRTUE OF RELIGION, yet he is a Pastor as long as he exerciseth the office of a Bishop : and the Sheep must not resist the Shepherd.] Princes and Parliaments must note this.

XXIII. An. 876. A *Concilium Titin.* maketh Charles Emperor against *Ludovicus*, the Popes expressly claiming the Power of electing, approving and making Emperours as his right. And Stephen 5 alias 6. with Bishops and Lords depose the Emperour (*Carolus Crassus*) after, as too dull. And the Pope telleth the Emperour *Basil*, that the Sacerdotal Dignity is not subject to Kings , and that Kings are authorized to meddle only with worldly Matters, and Popes and Priests with Spiritual;

ritual ; Therefore their Place is more excellent than Emperours, as Heaven is above Earth. And the Disciple is not above his Lord.

XXIV. *An.* 888. A Council at *Mentz* saith, [That a King ruling impiously and unjustly, is a Tyrant and not a King.]

XXV. *Ibid.* Whereas Clergymen were accused for getting their own Sisters with Child, it was decreed, that no Presbyter accuse a Bishop, nor any Deacon a Presbyter : And that no Prelate be Condemned but under Seventy two Witnesses, and that the chief Prelate be Judged of no Man ; And a Cardinal Presbyter under Forty two Witnesses, and a Cardinal Deacon under Twenty six, and Sub-deacons, Acoluthes, Exorcists, Readers, Door-keepers, not under Seven Witnesses, and all these without Infamy having Wives and Children. (O secure Wickedness !)

XXVI. *Ibid.* The Punishment of one Murdering even a Priest is, To forbear Flesh and Wine, and not to be carried in a Coach, and not to come to Church in Five years, nor to the Sacrament in Twelve.

XXVII. *An.* 895. In Concil. *Tribur.* If the Bishop command the people to meet in one place, and the Magistrate in another, they must obey the Bishop, and not the Magistrate : He and all his Company shall obey the Bishop.

* C. 10. No Bishop shall be deposed but by Twelve Bishops, nor no Presbyter but by Six Bishops.

XXVIII. *An.* 912. A Council at *Constance* decree that none Marry within the Seventh degree.

XXIX. *An.* 1049. *Leo* 9th and his Council of Bishops sit at *Rhemes*, though the King forbad them.

them. But they decree that no man be promoted to Church Government without the election of the Clerks and the People.

XXX. *An. 1050.* Two Councils condemn *Be-rengarius* and *Jo. Scotus's* Doctrine of the Sacrament. As others after did at *Rome*, and forced him to recant and profess Transubstantiation in sense.

XXXI. The Pope and Bishops *An. 1055.* Interdict the whole Kingdom of *Castile*, 'unless King *Ferdinand* submit to the Emperour *Henry*, where they require him.

The choice of Popes by Cardinals introduced.

No man is to hear Mass of a Priest that he knoweth to have a Concubine (a Wife).

Pope *Alexander* declareth King *Harold* a Usurper, and set up *William* the Conquerour as in Right.

He brings in the Payment of *Peter Pence* to the Pope.

XXXII. *Greg. 7.* Claimeth Presentations and Investitures : Excommunicateth and deposeth the Emperour in a Roman Council, and Excommunicateth all Bishops that were for him : Absolveth his Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance : Saying, [*It is meet that he be deprived of Dignity, who endeavoureth to diminish the Majesty of the Church:*] Commandeth that no King dare to resist his Legates : Calls the King of *France* a ravening Wolf : Declares in Council their Power to put down Kings : Challengeth *Spain* as *St. Peter's* Patrimony : Threatens the ruine of the Prince of *Calais* if he make not his Bishops shave their Beards : Challengeth *Peter Pence* of *France*.

I would transcribe out of *Binnius* the Pope's 27 Dictates

Dictates or Determinations containing all the Papal Usurpations or most, but that it is tedious, and you may there see them, or in my Summary of the Bishops Councils, pag. 356 translated.

XXXIII. *An. 1074.* In a Council at *Rome*, Priests are not only forbidden Marriage, but commanded to put away their Wives.

XXXIV. *An. 1078.* A Roman Council pronounceth all Ordinations null, not made by the common Consent of Clergy and People]. (And must we agree to nullifie almost all the Church of *England.*)

XXXV. *An. 1079.* A Council forced *Berengarius* to Recant.

And *An. 1080.* another Excommunicateth and deposeth the Emperour.

XXXVI. *An. 1085.* A Council at *Quintilenburg* maketh the Emperour's Claim of Investitures, and not obeying the Pope to be Heresie, and calls it by the Name of the *Henrician Heresie*; that is *Loyalty*, or not being against Kings at the Pope's Command. And this Heresie is after oft Condemned.

XXXVII. *Victor's Council, An. 1087.* declareth that Simoniacks are Hereticks and Infidels, (and all Lay Patrons are Simoniacks with them that claim Presentations and Investitures) and not to be communicated with; and that it's better communicate with God only in secret than with such.

XXXVIII. *An. 1090.* A Council at *Melfa* decree that no Lay-man hath Right or Authority over a Clergy-man, or may invest any.

XXXIX. *An. 1094.* A Council at *Constance* decree against Married Priests.

XL. *An.* 1095. A Council at *Clermont* command that no Bishop or Priest make any Promise of Allegiance to a King or any Lay-man: And that every Lay-labourer abate or pay the Tenth of his Wages to the Clergy.

XLI. About 1100. a Council decreed that all Bishops of the Henrician Heresie (for Loyalty) be depos'd ; and if dead, dig'd up and burnt.

XLII. *An.* 1108. A Council at *Benevent* decree, that if any take a Benefice from a Lay-man's Presentation , the Giver and Taker shall be Excommunicate.

XLIII. *An.* 1180. A General Council (as they call it) at *Laterane* under *Alexander* the 3d, call'd the *Eleventh General Council* , condemning those whom they call *Catharoi*, *Puritans* , absolve Inferiours from all Duty and Fidelity to them ; and promise Indulgence to those that fight against them.

XLIV. *An.* 1215. was the great Fourth *Laterane* General Council , under Pope *Innocent* 3d. which obligeth Princes to exterminate all that are against Transubstantiation, &c. and else deposeth, excommunicateth and damnneth them.

Thus you see what must be the Protestant Religion, when our present Church of *England* is United with the Roman.

Obj. Some of these were but Provincial Councils.

Ans. And are you not in *England* for obeying Provincial Councils? Ple then omit transcribing *Spelman's*.

Chap. IX. *Whether the Instance of the Apostles Church Government prove an Universal Sovereignty in the Bishops, further considered.*

§ 1. **T**HE pretence of all the Bishops in the World to the Government of all the Church on Earth, as one Aristocratical Senate, College or Court, is so monstrous a fiction, that were it not for that shadow of an Argument which they fetch from the instance of the Apostles and their pretended Succession, I should think it would expose the pretenders to be taken for distracted men: And therefore whether this instance will prove them in their wits, let us further try.

§ 2. The Apostles Commission is contained in *Matth. 28. 18, 19, 20. All power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth: Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and loe I am with you alwaies even unto the end of the World.*

Here, 1. Christ's proper Universal Power is both the cause of their Commission, and the matter which they must Preach. 2. Their appointed work is, 1. To make Nations Christ's Disciples, 1. By Teaching: 2. By Baptizing them. 2. To Teach them when they are Disciples. That which they must teach them when they are Disciples is, To observe all Christ's Commands. These Laws or Commands are but what Christ himself commanded

manded these Disciples. To the performance of this Commission he promised them to give them the Holy Spirit to bring all things to their remembrance, and to lead them into all Truth, and to be with them even to the end. The Spirit thus eminently given for this special work, was Christ's promised Substitute, or as *Tertullian* calls him his *Vacarius* and *Agent*, so that what the Spirit so commanded Christ commanded: Christ's Commission to them contained much proper to themselves *viz.* By this extraordinary help of the Spirit to Remember what Christ had commanded them, and what they had seen him do, and to deliver it with special Power, and seal it with special Gifts and Miracles, and to Record it Sufficiently and Infallibly as his History, Doctrine and Law, for the use of the whole World unto the end. And so he was with them to the end of their Age, and is with their recorded Word to the end of the World. And his Commission contained much common to others, that is, To Preach the same Christ, and gather Disciples, and Baptize them, and to teach the Disciples all those Commands which Christ had delivered to his Apostles by his Mouth or Spirit; And with these also in this Work Christ will be to the end of the World.

§ 3. Here we must first consider what was the Apostles Power and Work. 2. And then whether all Bishops have the same. 3. And what the extent of their Work was, when they are sent to all Nations, or all the World.

§ 4. 1. It is plain that [*All Power*] is not theirs but Christs: They are but his Ministers.

2. They are not Authorized to be Legislators them-

themselves, so as to make any Universal Law as their own ; But only to be Teachers of the Laws of Christ, even such only as they received from him.

Accordingly they never made any Universal Law as their own ; But only told the World what Christ Commanded by his Word and Spirit.

3. They were not made an Aristocratical College to do this by the authority of a Major Vote: For as the same Spirit of Truth was given to every one of them singly, so singly they were herein as Infallible as altogether.

4. Accordingly they Preached abroad the World the same Gospel by the same Infallible Spirit. *Paul* did not so much as speak or consult with any Apostles before he Preached, as receiving his Gospel not from Man but from God, *Gal.* 1. and 2.

5. The Universal Laws Promulgate by them, are the matter of the several Books of the New Testament: And there is not one of all these, written in the Name of the College or Senate of the Apostles, but every one of them by that single person whose name they bear, or imply. If Christs Law had been to have been *made* or *delivered* by the authority of a College as such, some one of the Gospels or Epistles would have been so written.

6. Yet while they abode together at *Jernsalem* no doubt they lived in Concord, and held the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, and believed and spake the same things ; And so they did when they were dispersed abroad the World. And no doubt but their consent was more useful to convince others that they spake Truth, than themselves who otherwise knew it.

7. In cases not revealed by the Spirit, they had the same use for consulting and reasoning the case and learning of others, as all other men: In this case reasoning was to help them to know: But in case of Inspiration Reasoning did but express and exercise their Knowledg.

8. As that *Act. 15.* was no more a General Council, than the other Sacred Converse of the Apostles till they dispersed themselves, so in their determinaton they lay it upon the Holy Ghost: And *Paul* and *Barnabas* had before by the same Spirit accordingly determined: But because they were not of the men that had received their knowledge from Christs own works and mouth in converse with him on Earth, no wonder if the Jewish Christians desired fuller satisfaction.

§ 5. II. From hence it is apparent, 1. That ordinary Pastors or Bishops who have not the same *Commission*, nor the same *Inspiration* or promise of it, nor the same gift of Tongues and Miracles to confirm their Doctrine, have none of the extraordinary Apostolical work to do. The Commands which Christ gave his Apostles to teach the World, are already told us and recorded by the Apostles. They left not part of that work undone for others after them to do. If they had, how could the Bishops have known but from the Apostles themselves what Christ Commanded? And what means have they to know it but what all other men have? The Scripture now (added to the Law of Nature) containeth all that can pretend to be an Universal Law: For no Law but of a Universal Lawgiver, can be Universal. And if all Bishops pretend to Apostolick Inspiration, they must prove it by Miracles or pats for Fanaticks: And methinks those
among

among us, who deride even the pretence of Praying by the Spirit, when it meaneth no Enthusiasm, but the illuminating, quickning and sanctifying influx of the Spirit, should hardly believe that all or most of the ignorant and erroneous Bishops of the World have Apostolick Inspiration. If they have, are not their Decrees and Writings God's Word, and equal to the Scriptures?

God's Law is not so imperfect a thing, nor Christ so imperfect a Law-giver, as that more and more must be added to it, and no man can tell by whom, nor when it will be perfect. Nothing unnecessary is fit for an Universal Law; And all that is Universally necessary Christ hath done already. An Universal Law-giver is a Christ: If a false pretender, he is a false Christ.

But all Pastors are Successors to the Apostles as ordinary Ministers, in that ordinary part of their work; *viz.* To Preach Christ, and make and baptize Disciples, and teach them to observe all that Christ commanded the Apostles, as Official Guides of their several Flocks: And to do this in order, decently, and to edification: And being the Church-Guides, it is their Office to judge of their own acts, that is, when, where, in what words to Preach and Pray, and whom to Baptize, and to whom to deliver the Sacraments of Communion, &c.

§ 6. III. But the next doubt is of the extent of the Apostles Office, and next of the Bishops and ordinary Pastors.

And, 1. It is evident that what the Apostles did in delivering Christ's Commands in writing (in the Scriptures) though at first and most immediately it was for the use of particular Persons
and

and Churches, yet was intended for all the Christian World, as being the Word of the Universal Bishop and King.

2. But their Personal Vocal Preaching was confined by natural necessity. Their Mandate or Commission was but indefinite, or limitedly universal. Christ never bound them to go to every Nation or Person in the World; else how greatly had they sinned? They went not into the fourth part of the Earth: And in those parts, not to one person of many hundred or thousands: Yet their Commission had no positive prohibition restraining them from any one place or person: But Natural Incapacity restrained them. They were to go as far as they could, and speak to as many in the World as they could. And this Mandate was given to each one; nor do we read that ever they went abroad all twelve together, nor ever met when dispersed to consult; nor ever judged any cause or persons as a College, after.

It was easie for them to meet when they dwelt together; and easie to govern all Christians when they were all before them or at hand: And easie to record Christ's Laws and Doctrine by which all must be governed to the end, being thereunto inspired by his Spirit. But as the Church grew greater, they increased the number of Pastors; but gave them no Universal Sovereignty.

§ 7. And now what pretence can ordinary Ministers or Bishops have for Universality of Sovereignty, Legislation and Judgment in an Aristocratical Senate or Council? If they were Apostles they must but teach men to observe all Christ's Commands. They may do their proper work as far as they have capacity and ability: If they can
Preach

Preach at the Antipodes we shall pray for their success: But sure they will not do it as a Senate; or Church Parliament: To leave them no excuse Christ hath left no Universal Legislation or Judgment to do.

The continuance of the Question so oft answered [*How shall Controversies be ended? And who shall Judge?*] When they never attempt to confute our answer, sheweth that they are so full of themselves, that they have not room for the plainest Truth that comes from others. Judgment of Controversies is *Private* or *Publick*, that is, either *Private Mens Discerning Judgment*, or *Governors Deciding Judgment*: The Private is either that of each single person for himself, and this is every mans as he is a Rational, Moral Agent, who cannot do his Duty undiscerned, or it is for the guidance of Charity to others: And that is either the Judgment of an Arbitrator, or of a private Instructor or Reprover: Hitherto there is no difficulty who shall Judge.

Publick Judgment supposeth a *forum*, Tribunal, and a Ruling Judge: And every one is Judge *in proprio foro*, in his own Court: The Magistrates in their several Degrees are Judges in their several Courts, who shall suffer or be Protected by them. And the Pastors in their several Churches, who shall be Baptized, and used as of their Communion; and who not. But there is no *Universal forum* or Court to judge all the World, but Christs: None out of this Kingdom, are publick Judges of King or Subjects. Other Princes and Prelates all over the World, have a *judicium privatum* whether they will take our King and Kingdom for Christians, and Communicate with them, or not;
and

and such a judgment have we towards any other Nation: But a Ruling Publick Judgment none hath out of the Kingdom Civil or Ecclesiastick. All Controversies shall be ended by Christ at last: It's Madness to think of ending all till then; so that there is no Judgment but Christ's, that is, *Universal* and *Final* for the ending of Controversies or deciding any Cause by Government.

And were there nothing but a double incapacity. 1. NATURAL, and 2. POLITICAL or Accidental by the restraint of the Princes of the Earth, I have oft shewed here, that a Dream of an Universal Sovereign Council or Senate, yea or Pope, is utterly irrational.

§ 8. But if the Apostolick Succession prove not such a Sovereignty, will not the Antient General Councils do it? No I have oft enough proved that General Councils were but General in the Empire: While they kept sober and humble they never claimed more; Nor was there any on Earth that had power to call them out of all the World: And when they claimed more, they broke the Church, and by Usurpation brought on Desolation. There is neither Scripture, nor reason, nor obliging example, for extending the Ecclesiastick jurisdiction beyond the Civil, but much of all these against it.

§ 9. And what man can think that a *claim* is the proof of a *title* in those Councils which began to transgress the bounds of Civil jurisdiction? The many Councils which have been for *Arians*, *Eutychians*, *Nestorians*, *Monothelites*, Adoration of Images, Papal tyranny, &c. and the many that have contradicted and condemned them, tell us that the Right of Councils must have a better proof

proof than their own affirmation: And the far greater number of Christians that have approved or received the Erroneous, tell us that they need a better proof than the reception of the greater part. How great a part received *Greg. 7th.* dictates, and the Councils that Hereticated Royalists as *Henricians*? But that proved not that these things were just. *Pope Urbans Letter to King Lewis 13th of France 1629.* (in the 2d. part of the *Cab.* p. 213.) saith [“*Your Ancestors have ever born as much respect to the exhortations of Popes, as to the Commandment of God.*”] But do these words prove that this is true? No more doth it that *Leo the first* was *Caput Ecclesie Universalis* because he so called himself. The Grand Signiour (in his Defiance of *Maximilian the Emperor* *ibid.* p. 12.) calls himself [*God in Earth; Great and High Emperor of all the World, the Great Helper of God, King of Kings, the only Victorious and Triumphant Lord of the World, and of all Circuits and Provinces thereof.*] And more Persons are *Mahometans* than *Christians* (and more *Heathens* than either, or both) and yet none of this proveth *Truth and Right.*

§ 10. I have marvelled that *Carol. Boverius* should think it a fit Argument to move our late *King Charles 2d.* in *Spain* to turn *Papist*; that *Monarchy* is the best Government in the State, Ergo, the *Papal Monarchy* in the Church: Did he think the King so dull, that he could not distinguish *Particular Kingdoms* and *Monarchs*, from *Universal*? How would the King have taken it, if he had said [*Sir an Universal Monarchy is the best humane Government: therefore you must subject your self and Kingdom to one Universal Monarch.*]

But the pretence of an Universal Democracy, Aristocracy, or Church-Parliament is more absurd and worse, as I have proved.

§ 11. Do our Changers of Government think that it is a small matter, of which King and People will take no notice, but be decoyed into by degrees in the dark, to make King, Lords, Bishops and all the Kingdom the Subjects of a Foreigner, and of a Parliament of Prelates who are themselves the Subjects of a Multitude of Foreign Princes, (Mahometans, Heathens, Greeks, Papists, &c.) As the Child said [*My Mother ruleth my Father, and I rule my Mother, and my Father ruleth the City: Therefore I rule the City,*] So we may then say the King ruleth *England*; and a Council of Foreign Prelates rule the King; and Heathen, Mahometan, Moscovian, Armenian, Papist, &c. Princes rule most of the Bishops in Council: *Ergo* these Princes rule the King.

Do they know what it is for Pope or Prelates abroad to be made Judges Ecclesiastical of all persons and causes here; and to have Power to Excommunicate King, and Lords, and depose Bishops, and silence Ministers, and Hereticate Dissenters, and Interdict the Kingdom? &c. Again and again I say, that I wonder if those men that have promoted so many Oaths, and Promises (in the Acts of Corporations, Uniformity, Vestries, Confinement, Conventicles, Militia, (*never to endeavour any alteration of Government in Church or State* ; can possibly blind the Nation to think it no alteration to Subject King, Church and Kingdom to a Foreign (pretended Universal) Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction? Whether it be Perjury or Treason is no debate for me; but I am sure that *in ordine*

ad

ad S
and
and
thin
§
Cour
Emp
yea
up in
mun
any
num
tion
Con
of it
publ
publ
one
of C
an e
not
nica
Chri
Y Co
3. 10
secon
nor g
judic
Rel

ad Spiritualia a great temporal power will follow; and Excommunicating and Anathematizing Kings and People, hath not hitherto been a Toothless thing. But *quos perdere vult Jupiter hos dementat.*

§ 12. And what if they had found Ancient Councils Excommunicate some men without the Empire? What pitty is it that any where Lords; yea Bishops and Clergy men should be bred up in such Ignorance as to think that all Excommunicating is an act of Government? I said before, any Neighbour Prince, Nation or People, any number of Bishops, when they hear another Nation turned notorious Hereticks may renounce Communion with them, and declare the reason of it, because they have made themselves incapable: *Governing Excommunication per judicium publicum, id est, per personam publicam seu Rectorem* is one thing; and a *declared renunciation and refusal of Communion, per judicium privatum*, that is, by an equal or private person is another thing. I am not bound to stay till Turk or Pope is Excommunicated by their Governours, before I renounce Christian Communion with them. *Paul's charge; 1 Cor. 5. With such a one no not to eat, and Tit. 3. 10. A Man that is an Heretick after the first and second admonition avoid; and St. John's Bid him not good speed, &c.* may bind equals that have but *judicium privatum discretionis*, when no Superior Ruler Excommunicateth the Sinner.

Chap. X. *Some Questions about General Councils, to be resolved before all the World can subject Kings, Kingdoms, Souls and Scripture to their Government or Decrees, and take them for the Unifying Ruling-Power over the Universal Church.*

Nothing can be more necessary to all Christians, Learned and Unlearned, than to be sure of the truth of that which must be the foundation of all our obedience and our hopes; And therefore if it be the General Councils Actual or Virtual (in the chief Patriarchs and Metropolitans, or supposed College of Bishops) which is the Unifying or Constitutive Regent part of the Universal Church, and on whose credit we must take the Scripture to be God's Word, and from whose Judgment we must not appeal to Scripture or to God; it's the *primum necessarium* that we be sure of the Authority and Infallibility or Credit of such Councils.

And first, we are to consider the matter of their Determining Power. 1. There are Things; 2. Words; 3. The signification of words to be judged of.

2. There are Truths of Natural and of *Supernatural* Revelation to be judged of.

3. There are the Essentials of Christianity, the Integrals and the Accidents to be judged of.

4. And the Judgment is, 1. Witnessing, 2. Teaching, 3. Or judicially Deciding.

We must first know who are the Judges. 2. What is their work. 3. How certain they are.

Q. 1. Did not Apostles and other Preachers singly convert men (even thousands) before there was any General Council? and that by such evidence as the single Preacher brought? Or was it by the Argument of Universal Consent that every one then was converted? *e. g.* the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* The Jailor and *Lydia, Act. 16.* *Cornelius* and his house, *Act. 10.* The three thousand, *Act. 2. 37, &c.*

Q. 2. Did none that *St. Paul* wrote his Epistles to believe them till they were told that all the Teachers and Bishops of the Churches gave them their Authority? Were the Gospels written by *Matthew, Mark, Luke* and *John* received only by the Argument of the Councils or Colleges Authority?

Q. 3. Did not Christ that sent out his Preachers by two and two, and bid them shake off the dust of their feet as a Witness against those that did not receive them, expect that they should be received and believed without the Authority of a Council?

Q. 4. Did Christ or his Apostles ever institute a General Council, or Unifying College of Bishops to be the standing Aristocratical Government of all the Universal Church as one?

Q. 5. Would not this have been plainly done, if the certainty of Scripture and Salvation, and the Churches Unity had been founded on it?

Q. 6. If thousands were then made Christians without the knowledge of Councils or College, may they not be so now?

Q. 7. Was the Church no Church, or ungoverned for the first 300 years when there was no General Council?

Q. 8. And were **not** Christians all that while sure that the Scripture was true? And were they not of the same Faith as now?

Q. 9. Was it not *Constantine* that called the first General Council at *Nice*? and had he any Authority to call any but his Subjects?

Q. 10. Do not the Subscriptions of the Antient Councils shew that they were General only as to the *Roman Empire*, and not to all the World?

Q. 11. How shall we be sure that the Council of one Nation or Empire is Ruler of all the other Kingdoms of the World?

Q. 12. When Councils of equal number, and called by equal Authority of Emperors, condemned one another (in the days of *Constantius, Valens, Valentinian, Gratian, Arcadius* and *Honorius, Theodosius senior and junior, Martian, Zeno, Basiliscus, Leo, Philippicus, Anastasius, Justinian, &c.* how were all men and women sure which was of Conciliar Power, and which not? As to their faulty carriage each accused other.

Q. 13. Seeing so many then erred, and are called Hereticks at this day, (as the Councils of *Tyre, Ephes. 2. Arimin, Sirmium, Milane, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Rome, &c.*) how shall we now be sure which err not?

Q. 14. If we must believe Scripture on the credit of Councils, must we not also believe which Councils are true upon the credit of Councils? And if so, is it on the Authority of that *same Council*, or *another*? If of the *same*, then must every Council, even the Heretical, be so believed, or which, and how known? If of *another*, must the Church suspend its belief of one Council till another is called to attest it? And on what account

is that other to be believed? And what if the later condemn the former, and the next condemn that (as *Florence* and *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*?)

Q. 15. Is it all the Council agreeing, or the *major* Vote against the rest that hath the credit or authority aforesaid?

Q. 16. How shall we be sure that the *minor* part are not in the right?

Q. 17. How shall all the distant World be sure the Votes were truly taken?

Q. 18. Why was the *major* Vote counted invalid if the Patriarchs were against it? And are those Patriarchs of Divine Authority & infallible?

Q. 19. What if one or two Votes turn the scales for a majority? and what if afterward more come in on the other side and turn it back the other way (as the *Constantinopol.* Council did in *Nazianzens* case) are both the sides infallible or authoritative? So at *Eph.* 1.

Q. 20. Who must call a valid Council? What if the Pope call one, and the Patriarch of *Alexandria* another, and the Emperor another? which is valid?

Q. 21. Is the Church no Church in the long intervals of Councils?

Q. 22. If it be, where is the Visible Constitutive Supremacy or Power? If in the Patriarchs and Metropolitans they are divided, and account each other sometime Hereticks, and sometime Schismaticks?

Q. 23. Who hath Authority to make Patriarchs now or Metropolitans for all the Christian World?

Q. 24. Must we now obey the *major* part of the old Patriarchal Seats?

Q. 25. If it be in all the Bishops of the Earth,
 1. Who shall go to them all over the World with
 all our Church cases? 2. Who shall judge which
 of them are Hereticks while they hereticate each
 other? 3. Who shall assure us that their Votes
 are truly gathered? 4. Who shall bring them
 from all over the Earth to the person to be judg-
 ed? 5. Can they judge truly without hearing the
 accused and their witnesses? 6. Where at this
 day may we find their Decrees by which they
 Rule, except in Councils?

Q. 26. Must a General Council (or this Col-
 lege) consist of all the Bishops of the World, or
 but of part?

Q. 27. If of all, is such a Council possible, or
 lawful?

Q. 28. If of part, who shall chuse them? And
 seeing undoubted experience tells us that most of
 the Clergy every where in such cases obey the
 Power that hath the Sword, whether the choice
 that is made in the Turks Empire will not be
 made by the Turk, and in other Kingdoms of
 Heathens, Infidels, Papists, Hereticks, by their
 several Kings and Magistrates? And can we be
 sure such are infallible?

Q. 29. If the Empire of *Abassia* have but one
 Bishop (the *Abinna*) shall that Empire have but
 one Vote in Councils, and be ruled by the rest?
 And is it not certain that those next the Antipodes,
 and remotest Kingdoms, can send but few? and
 must they therefore be ruled by those near the
 place who will be many?

Q. 30. Yea, is it not wickedness or madness
 to attempt to call aged Bishops (or any) from
 all the Christian World, to displease prohibiting
 Princes,

Princes, to hazard their lives in travel many years, to forsake their Flocks so long, and by differing Languages not able to understand each other; nor like to live long enough to bring home the Decrees, when perhaps they must sit so many years in Council as they did at *Trent* (wearing out the lives of many Popes) (And what is the necessity of all this?)

Q. 31. If those few that are sent do that which the rest at home dissent from, is it valid? *e. g.* King *James* chose Six to go to the Synod at *Dort*, and most then consented, and most now dissent; The Parliament chose a Synod of one Mind, and the King by his Clergy one of another.) And how shall we know that the Churches own the Acts of their Delegates, and dissent not (as the Greeks did after the Council of *Florence*? Can all Men and Women rest on things no better known to them?

Q. 32. Seeing that it is notorious that the Bishops of almost all the Christian World, except part of *Europe*, are very unlearned ignorant Men, (*Armenians, Georgians, Iberians, Mengrelians*, most of the *Greeks, Moscovites*, and the numerous Easterns called *Nestorians*, and *Jacobites*, and *Copties*, &c. and abundance of the Papists also in *Europe*) How shall we be sure that so many Ignorant Men (and too vicious) will do the work of Wise or Infallible Judges of the Christian World, if they do but meet together in Council? (much less as scattered and called a College.) Must not this be by an undeniable Miracle? And hath God promised to Govern his Church by constant Miracles; yea, as many Miracles as there be ignorant and wicked Bishops, and that through all Generations?

Q. 33:

Q. 33. Doth it not require great Knowledge of History to be sure what Councils there have been, and which were Orthodox and which Heretical, which valid and which invalid, and what they did? and which side had the Major Vote? And is all this Historical Knowledge necessary to Salvation, in Learned and Unlearned?

Q. 34. Yea, Is there one *Priest* of *many* that hath such certainty of such History of Councils, when Writers so much disagree?

Q. 35. Seeing Historians are but like other men, and all men are lyars or untrusty, and it's notorious that Ignorance, Faction, Temerity and Partiality, if not Malignity, hath filled the World with so much false History, that except in Matters of Publick uncontradicted Evidence, no man well knoweth what to believe, How shall all Christians lay their Salvation on so great knowledge of History as is necessary to certainty herein?

Q. 36. If the belief of Councils (or the College of Bishops as wide as the World) be fundamentally necessary to Duty, Unity, or Salvation, Is it not necessary that all know what are their Decrees and Laws? And how can they know this when Councils and Decrees are so Voluminous; and few Priests know them? and when the World is yet disagreed, what Canons or Laws are obligatory, and what not? But they contradict and condemn each others Laws?

Q. 37. If a Lay-man should know but *one part* of the Councils Decrees about Faith or Obedience, will such a defective h^lt Faith and Obedience save him? or must he know all?

Q. 38. If you say that all this Historical Knowledge

ledge is not necessary to the Laity, but they must believe herein the Priests or Bishop that is over them. 1. How is this then a belief of Councils? 2. What shall the poor People do, that one of many hundred of them never see their Bishop, much less ever spake with him. 3. And are their Priests infallible herein or not?

Q. 39. Doth not this by the deceitful noise of the Catholick Church and Councils, and a College of Bishops, make every Parish Priest's word the very Foundation into which all mens Faith must be resolved? And he that saith [I believe the Scripture, because the Church and Councils propose it or attest it, and I believe that the Church and Council say it, because the Priest saith it] Doth he not say as much as [I believe the Scripture, Church and Councils upon the bare word of the Priest?]

Q. 40. Is it not hard for the People that know their Priests to be sottish, ignorant, prophane, drunken, malicious men, to lay all their Salvation on a supposed certainty that these Priests say true?

Q. 41. If the Parishioners know also that their Priests never read the Councils, and confess that he is ignorant of them, and know him also to be a common lyar, Can they certainly believe the Scripture and the Councils, and the Matters of Faith, and duty contained in both, upon the word of such a Priest?

Q. 42. Can they that are unlearned and never see a Bishop, tell whether the Parish Priest and the Bishop say the same? Or whether their Bishop be of the same Mind with the other Bishops? and whether the Bishops e. g. of *England* be of the same

same Mind with the Bishops of *France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, &c.* and they of the same Mind with the Greeks, &c.

Q. 43. Is it a *Divine Faith* that is resolved thus into the meer belief of Man; yea, of an Ignorant Priest or Prelate? or but a *Humane*?

Q. 44. If we and all men had *no other certainty* of the Scripture but the word of such a Priest, or the Decree of a Council, would it be more or less certain to us than now it is?

Q. 45. Have none of all those Christians a true *Divine Faith*, who are converted by Protestant Preachers, who teach them to believe the Scripture upon other Evidence than a Councils word?

Q. 46. By what Evidence doth a Council know the Scripture to be God's Word? Is it only by the Testimony of a *former Council*? If so, How did that *former Council* know it? and so the *first Council* that had none before to testifie it? And what use is there for the assertion of the *later Council*, when it's done already by a *former*?

Q. 47. Why doth not *one Council* determine of all that is necessary to Salvation, but leave it still undone? But if it *be done*, must new ones be called to the end of the World, to say the same thing over again, and do that which others had done before them?

Q. 48. Is not the Law the Rule of *Duty* and *Judgment*? and must all Christians be Judged at last by the Bishops Canon Law? And seeing Sin is a Transgression of the Law, and it's harder to obey a Thousand Laws than a few; Are not they the most Mortal Enemies to Christians who make them so many Laws, and make Salvation so hard a work?

Q. 49.

Q. 49. Seeing Christ was above three Years teaching his Apostles before he died, and after his Resurrection [was seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, and being assembled together with them, commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem; but wait for the Promise of the Father, even the Spirit to lead them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance, and their Commission was to teach all Christians to observe whatever Christ commanded (Act. 1. 3, 4. Math. 28. 19, 20.) is it to be believed that yet Christ by himself and his Spirit in these Apostles did not make all the Laws that are Divine, and enow for the Universal Church to observe as necessary to Salvation and Universal Concord?

Q. 50. Is it not enough to Salvation and Church Concord for all the Pastors of the Churches to agree, 1. In preserving these Laws and Doctrines of Christ? 2. And to teach the People to know and obey them? 3. And to defend them against Adversaries? and 4. To make them the rule of their Communion by the exercise of the Keys? 5. And by their own Authority to determine of variable Circumstances of Worship (such as the Place of meeting, the time, the translation, the subject for the day, &c.) Is there besides all this a necessity of Universal Laws for the Salvation and Concord of Believers, and of a standing Sovereign Power in Priests, Prelates or Patriarchs or Pope to make such Laws?

Q. 51. Have we not better assurance that the foresaid Apostles taught by Christ, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, had Authority and Infallibility for this work, than we can have that Pope, Patriarchs, Prelates or Priests have it? Q.

Q. 52. When some English Prelates and Priests tell us that he is a Schismatick that obeyeth not the Universal Church, and that Schism is a damning Sin, do they not Preach meer desperation to all that have not more knowledge than I have, who cannot possibly find out a Governing Universal Church, nor its Laws, though I would willingly find it and obey it?

Q. 53. Do they not Preach common desperation who say that Schism is a damnable Sin, and he is in that guilt who suffers himself to be Excommunicated by Prelates for not obeying them in any *un sinful* condition of Communion? (as H. Dodwell speaketh.) Do not such *Carnifices animarum* make it necessary to Salvation, to know all the *un sinful* things in the World which a Prelate may impose to be *un sinful*? And is any man on Earth so Skilful? How many indifferent things are there which the wisest man may doubt whether they be indifferent: Of old it was thought enough to know the few things which God made necessary: and now these Tormenting Uniters make it necessary to know the multitude of things *indifferent* to be such?

Q. 54. Must we needs know what *sense perceiveth*, by the credit of a General Council or all the Bishops of the World? As whether I see the Light or Colours? What taste my Meat hath, &c? If not, why may I not take Bread to be Bread, and Wine to be Wine, on the credit of my senses, though the Bishops or Council say the contrary?

Q. 55. Must I have the Authority of a Council or College of Bishops to believe that there is a God, and that he is most Great and Wise and Good, most Holy, Merciful, True and Just? or

to k
Imm
and
The
of N
And
Sove

Q
Gen
stian
stian
stian

Q
spaci
Cree
or d
on li
a Pr

Q
was

Q
Cane
of t
Tren

Q
us ag

Q
tell t
fully
Coun

Q
files

Q
or ac

Q
Spec

to know that there is a Life to come, and the Soul Immortal? or that men must not hate the Good, and love the Evil as such, nor live in Murder, Theft, Adultery, Perjury, &c. Doth not the Law of Nature bind men without a Council of Prelates? And can they null that Law by their pretended Sovereignty?

Q. 56. Must every man have the Sentence of a General Council (or College as wide as the Christian World) to satisfy him of the truth of Christianity before he is Baptized, and made a Christian?

Q. 57. Must we know what the Council or spacious College saith, before we believe the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments? or did the ancient Christians receive them only on such Authority? Did not every Baptizer expect a Profession of the Creed?

Q. 58. Was not the Bible received before there was a General Council?

Q. 59. Have not Councils differed about the Canonical Books of Scripture? See Bishop *Cousins* of the Canon, Compared with the Council of *Trent*.

Q. 60. Must we have new Councils to deliver us again the same Creed and Bible?

Q. 61. Is it not a reproaching of Christianity, to tell the World that after 1691 Years it is not yet fully known what it is, but we must have new Councils to tell it us, and to make it up?

Q. 62. Did Councils only receive the old Apostles Creed, when they made so many new ones, or added so many Articles?

Q. 63. Was the Primitive Church of the same Species with the present Romish and Imposing Church

Church, when he was then a Christian who profess belief of the Creed as the Christian Symbol, and to desire according to the Lord's Prayer, and Praise according to Christ's Commands? And now so many other things are made necessary hereto.

Q. 64. Do not those men deal falsely who subscribe the 39 Articles of the sufficiency of the Scripture as to all things necessary to Salvation, and yet say that it's necessary to Salvation to obey the Bishop of the place in all *unfinsful* things, and consequently to Believe them all to be *unfinsful*?

Q. 65. Is it by the Divine Authority of a Council or Mundane College of Prelates, that we know which are the true Writings of *Ignatius, Irenaeus, Clemens R. & Alex. Tertullian, Cyprian, Hierom, Augustin, &c*? Or do their Critical Writers send us to the College or Council to know? If not, why may not the Canon of Scripture be known (yea much better) by meer Historical Tradition and inherent Evidence?

Q. 66. Is it not by History and not Church Power that we know what Popes have been at Rome, what Councils have been called, and what they decreed? And may not the same way secure us of the Matter of Fact about the Scripture?

Q. 67. Hath any Council or College yet Decreed which are the true and current Copies of the Original of the Scripture? and which of the various Lections are true? If they had agreed but of the vulgar Latin, would *Sixtus* 5th and *Clemens* 8th, have Published Editions so vastly different? If they never did it yet, when will they do it?

Q. 68. Did ever Council or College determine which is the truest Translation?

Q. 69. Did ever Council or College give the Church a Commentary on the Bible? 2.

Q. 70. Did they ever write a Decision of the multitudes of Controversies about the meaning of several Texts; and the multitudes of Doctrines which are yet controverted among Papists themselves and all the World?

Q. 71. Is it a Satisfaction, or a gross Cheat to tell us of a necessary Church Power, to Expound Scripture, and Judge of Controversies, who yet will not do it, but leave all unexpounded and undecided?

Q. 72. Was *Gregory Nazianzen* a Fool, that spake so much of the hurt that Councils do, and resolved never to go to more?

Q. 73. Can I know that Pope or Council have Authority given them by Christ, before I believe that Christ is Christ, and had Authority himself?

Q. 74. Can I know that Christ's Promise to Pope, Council or Prelate is true, before I know that the Promise of Justification, Adoption and Salvation are true: that is, Before I am a Christian?

Q. 75. Can I believe the Promise of Pardon and Salvation, or the Promise made to General Councils or Prelates, without knowing the meaning of those Promises? And can I believe the Churches Power from God, without believing the Promise of it? And if I can understand all these Promises without a Council, why may I not understand more? And how then do I receive all Scripture from a Council?

Q. 76. Do those that Preach to convert Infidels, in *Congo, China, Japan, Mexico*, among Turks, &c. Preach first the Authority of General Councils (or a Mundane College) as the *Primum credendum*, upon whose credit Christianity is to be received?

ved? Hath this been the way to Convert the World?

Q. 77. If *Paul* curse an Angel from Heaven if he bring another Gospel, and *Paul* charge *Timothy* to see that men Preach no other or new Doctrine, must there be Councils or a College to make either a new Gospel, or a new Doctrine, or Universal Law?

Q. 78. If men were saved without believing the Canons and Decrees of Councils before they were made, even by simple Christianity, is it not necessary Mercy to let men be so saved still?

Q. 79. If it be not a new Gospel, but mutable *Accidents* which the Church Laws do determine of, what need there an Universal Power or Sovereignty, or an Universal Law for such, when divers Churches and Countries may have divers such *Accidentals*, and the same Churches may change them as they see cause?

Q. 80. If it be not Legislation but Judicature that we must have an Universal Judge or Power for, what are the Cases that they must Judge? Sure it is not whether *John* or *Thomas* shall be judged capable of Baptism? or of the Lord's Supper? or whether he be an Adulterer, a Drunkard, and impenitent therein, and so to be Excommunicate? Must all the World come before all the World? Shall Millions of Sinners be unjudged till all the Bishops of the World Judge them? If it be Persons accused of Heresie, Schism or any Sin that must be judged, must they not be heard, and their witness heard before they can be judged justly? But if they Judge not of Persons but of Doctrines, whether they be Heresie or not, this will make no Alteration or Reformation; till it be

be judged what persons are guilty of such Errors or Heresies; And if particular Pastors on the place must judge all such persons, is not the Scripture the Rule of Faith a sufficient Rule to judge of Heresie by?

Q. 81. If it be whole Churches that are to be judged, will not a brotherly power of disowning their Communion serve, without a Governing Power? Had every one a Governing Power to whom the Apostles commanded with *such not to eat, nor bid them good speed*? May not Princes renounce Communion with Neighbour Princes and Nations without being their Governour?

Q. 82. In conclusion doth it not remain that this pretended Universal Sovereignty (Monarchical or Aristocratical) is the device of the Prince of Pride, a Treasonable Usurpation over all Princes, disobedience to Christ, *Luke 22.* and Antichristian Usurpation of his Prerogative, and a base Captivating of the Souls and Reason of Mankind, to a pretended Power which common sense, reason and experience, fully proveth to be a natural impossibility, or that which in practice no Mortal Man or College is capable of.

Chap. XI. *A Breviate of the Papists Faith and Church Doctrine, both the Monarchical and Aristocratical sort.*

§ 1. **V**Ve must believe that Christ hath a Church before we believe that he is Christ, the Redeemer.

§ 2. **V**Ve must believe that this Church is Infallible

fallible or our Governour before we can believe that Jesus is Christ, and our Governour.

§ 3. We must believe that Christ Promised Infallibility or Governing Authority to this Church before we can believe that he is Christ.

§ 4. We must believe that this Promise is true and shall be fulfilled, before we believe the Gospel Promise of Pardon and Salvation, that is, before we are Christians, or believe the Scripture.

§ 5. We must believe that the Pope is Christ's Vicegerent or Vicar General, (or General Councils at least) before we can believe that Christ is Christ.

§ 6. We must believe that the Words of the Apostles were Intelligible (else why did they speak) but their Writings are not, till a General Council make them so by an Exposition.

§ 7. We must believe that it is intelligible which be true Bishops and Councils, and what is the meaning of their Voluminous Decrees; but it is not intelligible what is the sense of the Scripture till Councils tell us.

§ 8. We must believe that God is the great Deceiver of the World, by sense and things sensible: *e. g.* by sense, which takes Bread to be Bread, and Wine to be Wine.

§ 9. We must believe that all men are Hereticks who deny not their senses; and all that believe sense (even of all the sound men in the World) shall be Damned. That is, All that believe God speaking by things sensible.

§ 10. We must believe that God who is the great Deceiver of the World, even to and by the senses, yet hath given a Spirit of Infallibility to those Popes and Prelates (in Council) who live in worldliness and wickedness.

§ 11. We must believe that an unlearned Pope and Prelates, who never understood the Original Tongue, but are ignorant men, are by Miracle in Council inspired with the gift of right expounding the Scriptures which they never studied or understood before.

§ 12. We must believe that every Priest how ignorant or wicked soever, doth by pronouncing the bare words of Consecration, work many Miracles; turning Bread into no Bread, Wine into no Wine, making quantity and other Accidents to exist without Substance, &c. And that he can work such Miracles every hour of the day; and if he can but get into a Bakers Shop or Vintners Celler to say Mass, may in malice undo the poor men when he will, by turning all their Bread and Wine into none.

§ 13. We must believe that the Roman Empire was all the Christian VWorld, or that a Council General as to that Empire, was General as to all the VWorld. And that the Roman Emperor or the Pope called the Bishops of all the VWorld together: And that the humane Primate of one Empire, was Governour of all the VWorld.

§ 14. VVe must believe that now that Empire is dissolved, the Laws then made bind all the Princes and Churches on Earth, viz. that a defunct power still ruleth even those that never owed them obedience.

§ 15. VVe must believe that we in *England* are rightfully under a Foreign Church Jurisdiction, contrary to the Oath of Supremacy.

§ 16. VVe must believe that all Temporal Lords must be sworn to extirpate all Protestants, and to perform it if able, on pain of Excommunication,

cation, Deposition and Damnation ; And that if they do not the Pope may execute this penalty of Excommunicating and Deposing them, and giving their Dominion to others, and may Absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance. *Concil. Later. sub. Innoc. 3. Can. 1, 2, 3.*

§ 17. VVe must Swear never to expound the Scripture but according to the Concordant sense of the Ancient Fathers, who never expounded much at all ; much less ever agreed in any Exposition of them all.

§ 18. VVe must believe that God hath given the Church, (that is, the Pope and Councils) a Power to Expound hard Scriptures, and to end Controversies, and that this is a great Blessing to us ; VVhen yet neither Pope nor Councils will give us a Commentary on the Bible, or exposition of hard Texts ; nor will determine most of the Controversies that now trouble us.

§ 19. VVe must believe that the Governing part of the Church is to be obeyed, and Gods VVord received but by their Proposal, when yet it is not known who is the Governing part, Pope or Council, nor which Councils be true and which but false Conventions ; nor can they assure us how we may ever come to know it.

§ 20. VVe must believe those Councils to be true and credible, which contradict and condemn each other : and that both are in the right.

§ 21. VVe must believe both that all Gods VVord in the Sacred Scripture is true, and that Councils and Popes say Truth when they contradict it.

§ 22. VVe must believe that those Popes were true Popes and continued the valid succession, and were

were Governours of all Christian Souls, whom General and Provincial Councils condemned as Simonists, Hereticks, Infidels, Atheists, or Devils Incarnate : and yet that Councils are to be believed as the Proposers of our Faith.

§ 23. VVe must believe that General Councils have Universal Jurisdiction, when there are none such, nor ever can be, nor ever were.

§ 24. VVe must stay for the ending of our controversies, till we know that which cannot be known, viz. what the Major Vote of all the Bishops on Earth Judge of them : or till such Councils end them as caused them & their continuance:

§ 25. When we have such Infallible Proof of the Scripture History as we have of the former Kings and Laws of the Land, by evidence of Natural certainty, we must exchange it for the uncertain determination of Popes and Councils, depending on their Authority, Knowledge and Honesty ; And the Infallibility of these who in all their lives else do shew much fallibility : And were either Pope or Council Infallible no man that is not Infallible himself in judging of their Infallibility, and also in knowing what it is that they propose as *de fide*, is ever the nearer an Infallible Faith.

§ 26. They must make it necessary to us to know that the Greeks, the Armenians, and all other Christians who are twice as many as the Papists, have some way forfeited their Authority and Credit : or else how shall we know that they being the Majority, are not to be believed before the Pope and his VVestern Councils.

§ 27. They make more Cosmography and History necessary to Salvation than God made, or Vulgar Heads are capable of. The name of *Rome*

is not in the Creed: It is not necessary to Salvation to know that there is such a place as *Rome* in the World: Much less to know all Countreys on Earth where Christians dwell, and which of them are of this Opinion or that; and which part hath the *major* Vote of Bishops, and is to be believed. If you say, They are Nestorians, Jacobites, Greeks, &c. the People be not bound to know what any of these names signifie.

Chap. XII. *A humble Expostulation to the zealous Antipapists, Conformists and Non-conformists, whether they are innocent as to promoting Popery?*

THIS is not written to cast on you any contempt or reproach: I acknowledge that I take you for the best Ministry, that any Nation on earth enjoyeth: But it is to try if it may be to promote our common Repentance, and to Reform the Nominal mistaken Reformation, of those that have sinned by extreams; which by the assumed name of Reformation, have wronged God and Truth, and mens Souls, with the greater advantage and success: But especially, if it may be yet to stop such from a sinful progress, that they may not ignorantly set up Popery, by crying down the name, and persons.

§ I. We have not sufficiently considered, how the Popes came to the Greatness that they have attained, and how and by whom it is kept up: I mean, how much the zealous Godly Christians did and do contribute thereto.

1. It was the great shame of other Churches by multitudes of Heresies, Sects and Contentions, that made *Rome* seem as a Post for those to hold by, that had by turning round become so giddy, that they could not stand.

2. When the best Pastors were persecuted, by proud Courtiers, erroneous Councils, factious Bishops, and *Arrian* Hereticks, because *Rome* had more Concord, Quietness and Power, they used to seek help from the Bishop of *Rome* in their necessity, and he was ready to take the advantage by helping them, to get the reputation of Supremacy: So did he by *Athanasius*, and *Chrysostom*, and the Eastern Bishops under *Valens* and *Constantius*, though *Basil* complaineth of the Western Bishops for minding them no more: The Popes owning of *Augustine* and *Prosper*, was a great help to him against *Pelagius*.

3. When the Bishops under the Pagans had endured Martyrdom, and Torments, and Banishments for Christ, their godly Flocks, when Christianity had conquered, thought none so fit for honour and power to govern and protect them, as the tryed survivors: And who could then be so fit? And so it was first the most pious Christians that advanced the Bishops, and over-advanced them: And specially the *Roman* Bishops, because very many of their Predecessors had been Martyrs and Confessors. Tho' we had many able Lay-Magistrates here, which *Constantine* had not quickly, yet those that put down Bishops were glad that the Power of Institution and Induction, and of Universities and Church Maintenance, should be in the hands of *Dr. John Owen*, *Dr. T. Goodwin*, *Mr. P. Nye*, *Mr. Bridge*, *Mr. Sydrach Symphon*, and
such

such other. And if the disposing of such advantages for Religion were now committed to Dissenters, whom would they sooner chuse for Power therein than their most esteemed Pastors?

3. When Emperors, Kings and Lords did pill and oppress the poor Commons, (as in *England* in the Reign of *William* the Conqueror *W. Rufus, &c.*) the Bishops were the only men that by the Power of the Pope were able to controul them, and for the honour of their Office, oft attempted it: And therefore the innocent oppressed People were glad of the Pope's help and theirs, to ease their yoke.

4. It was the Godly People to promote Christianity, and honour the memory of the Martyrs and Saints, that bring in the Praying at their Graves, and building Altars first, and Churches after to retain the honour of their names; and that carried and kept their bones and cloaths as honourable Relicks, and recited their names in their Service, and kept and honoured their Pictures, and after prayed to them. Much of that Superstition that is now most decied by us, was brought by the most religious sort.

5. Almost all the Societies of Fryers and Nuns, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, Carthusians, Jesuits, Oratorians, &c. have been set up by the most zealously Religious, when any fancied a peculiar way of strictness, the Bishops being against it, they made friends to the Pope to give them his Licence to serve God in their own devised way, and to have Government in their own Society without the Bishops controul: And the Pope craftily granted it, that they might all be his own, and maintain his Power which they were necessitated to depend on. So *Dr. Goodwin* and *Dr. Owen* told

King

King *Charles 2.* that they desired of him but what the Religious Orders had of the Pope. To serve God according to their judgment, and hold their Liberty from the King, and not to be under the Bishops or Presbytery. More such instances I might produce to shew you by what sort of men much of Popery came in, (but Pride and Worldliness did most.)

§ II. I humbly desire it may be thought on, whether some have not ignorantly given up the whole Cause to a Foreign Jurisdiction, by their Prophetical Exposition of Christ's Epistles to the seven *Asian Churches*, *Rev. 2. & 3.* while they take them to mean seven Ages and States of the Catholick Church, and two of them to mean the blessed Thousand years State. For whether by the Angel be meant, the Bishop alone, or the Bishop with his Elders, or the Presbyters as a College, it is plain one Governing Power over each Church (whether Monarch or Aristocracy) is there mentioned by the word Angel. And if the Universal Church have such in all Ages, and that by Christ's Institution, should we be against it? Even that which the Thousand years shall have?

§ III. It is a very ordinary Doctrine with us, that the Jewish Church was the Universal then in Infancy, or at least a Type of it: And if so, that Church had one *summa Potestas*, both in Magistracy and Ministry, sacredly Civil and Ecclesiastical: And Christ plainly offered to gather them under him, and continue their Polity (tho' not their Laws,) and set up twelve and seventy over them accordingly. You'll say, Though one *Aaron* was their Head, yet Christ is now the only High Priest, it followeth not that the Universal Church must have one Humane Priest or King. 1

I answer; By your way it will follow, that it must have one *Uniting Specifying Humane Sovereignty Civil and Ecclesiastical*. If *Aaron* be down, so is not the Sanedrim, Civil or Priestly. Christ plainly offered to continue them in one Visible Body, by his choice of twelve and seventy. And it is an Aristocratical Universal Jurisdiction that is as bad as the Monarchical. 2. Christ was not a Priest according to the Order of *Aaron*, but of *Melchizedek*. 3. Christ is Universal King as well as Priest; and hath National Kings under him supreme: Therefore his being King or Priest in *Israel*, would not exclude the necessity of a supreme King or Priest under him. And if *Israel* was the Catholick Church in Type or Infancy, it would follow that it also must have one such Head.

§ IV. Too few Protestants have sufficiently answered the Papists Argument fetcht from the instance of the Apostles, *viz.* "The College of Apostles (*Peter* called *Primus*) were one Aristocratical Governing Power over the Universal Church: *Ergo* such a Polity was instituted by Christ. And Christ never revoked this institution. Government as well as Word and Sacraments, is an ordinary work to be continued. And not as Miracles, Writing Scripture, Witnessing what they saw and heard, the extraordinary part of the Apostles VVork. *Ergo* in this they have Successors.

This is the plausiblest of all Arguments for an Universal Jurisdiction. I have shewed you how it prevailed with Bishop *Guning* and other *New Church-men* (I am not willing to say, *The new Church.*)

How

How it is to be answered I have before shewed, and more fully in my *Treatise of National Churches*.

§ V. Have not the old and many later Nonconformists advantaged Popery by decrying all Episcopacy or Imparity of Ministers? VVhen it is so plain that Christ did set Twelve above Seventy, and kept up the number by *Matthias*? and gave power to Apostles, and they to other to be exercised over other Churches and Pastors? And when it is apparent that all the Churches for many hundred years, had Episcopal Government, (though not such as Popery and Tyranny hath since brought in :) Those called Hereticks and Schismaticks were for it: The Novatians and Donatists over zealous for it, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Macedonians, Acacians, and all the Sects in the time of Heathen Persecution: I find not that *Aexius* (alone excepted) did ever call it unlawful, or saw that it was better for the Churches to be with them. But that the Bishops and Presbyters Officers were equal.

And will it not greatly confirm the Papists to find such Protestants reject the judgment and practice of all the ancient Churches, and differ from the rest of the Christian VVorld.

§ VI. But it advantaged them much more than our opinion; when the Scots Covenant was imposed as the necessary terms of Ministry and Magistracy: Thereby weakening the Protestants by a doleful Division, that by opinions were divided too much before. VVhen so great a part of the Kingdom, Clergy, Gentry and Vulgar were for the renounced Prelacy, to shut all these, and all of their mind that ever should come after, from Ministry and Magistracy, such men as *Usher*, *Beadle*, *Dow-*
name,

name, *Davenant, Brownrig, Ward, Prideaux, Field, &c.* Oh how many and how great ! was this to unite the Protestants, and to strengthen them against the United Papists ?

§ VII. And alas how greatly have those Zealous Protestants confirmed the Papists, and dishonoured the Church and Christ their King, that maintain that the Church became Antichristian in *Anno* 300 or 400, or at least 606, if not as soon as Christ by *Constantine* took possession of the Imperial Visible Government. I will not aggravate this as it deserveth : But I wonder not if it make thousands of Papists.

§ VIII. And Protestants too many have greatly hardened Papists, by too bold and forced Expositions of the *Apocalyps* ; and laying too much of the stress of their Cause on it (as that Pagan *Rome* is not the *Babylon* there meant, nor that *Rome* as the Mother or Nurse of Pagan Idolatry the Whore ; nor the Pagan Empire the Beast with seven Heads and ten Horns, nor the Pontifical, Oracular, Foretelling, and Literate Tribe, the Beast with two Horns, nor the Jew and Gentile Miracle-working persecuted Christians (radically Epitomized in *Peter* and *Paul*)
 “ the two Witnesses ; and that Antichrist is
 “ spoken of in the *Revelations* ; and that Christ
 “ intended it as a Prophecy of all the great Af-
 “ fairs and Changes of the Church to the end of
 “ the World.] I say, laying the stress of our
 “ Cause on these, is next to giving it away.
 “ When a Papist shall call for the proof of this,
 “ and ask whether *John* and the seven Churches
 “ understood it ; and what one man on Earth so
 “ expounded it of a Thousand years, or a
 “ Thousand

"Thousand four hundred after Christ? and why
 "Mr. Mede saith, That the *Waldenses* were the first
 "of all *Mortals* that took the Pope to be *Antichrist*.
 "And whether the Book was written for none
 "but a few men that agree not of the sence of it,
 "so near the End of the World?] It will puzzle
 the Hearers before all these, and many such Que-
 stions are well Answered. When we have so much
 plain Evidence against Popery in the whole Bible,
 to lay it mainly on these Expositions of the Reve-
 lation, (where I find not three men in thirty that
 differ not in great Material Points) is almost to
 betray it: when such a man as *John Fox*, P. III.
 Vol. I. Swareth that he had a Revelation con-
 trary to much of this, which he repeareth in his
 Comment on Revelations.

Specially those that venture to foretel thence
 the Year of Antichrist's fall, and other particulars,
 which time confuteth, do expose us to the Scorn
 of Confirmed Papists.

§ IX. Protestants have too often advantaged
 Popery, by ill answering the Question, *Where was*
your Church before Luther? Pleading the Catholick
 Churches invisibility. When *non apparere* and *non*
esse are oft equal in Argumentation: Greatly dis-
 honouring Christ, as if so near the end of the
 World, the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, (and some
 Papists that found fault with the Papal Miscarria-
 ges, had been all the known Church for Eleven
 hundred Years: To tell the Mahometans that the
 Kingdom of Jesus after so long endeavours, was
 scarce bigger than *Wales*, is not the way to honour
 Protestants, or Christ.

And then they think to repair the dishonour
 by their Prophecy of the Millennial Kingdom,
 which tieth the knot harder than before. s X.

§ X. Running from them into Errours on the other extream, and spotting the Reformation with many such Errours, hath greatly hardened and increased Papists. Especially those Antinomian or Libertine Opinions, that overthrow both Christianity and Morality; and that which inferreth these which too many have promoted: such are the wrong Opinions about Reprobation, and the Cause of Sin, and the extent of Redemption, and the false sence of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and of Justifying Faith, and of the meaning of *Works* that justifie not, and that to Believe we are justified and elected, is to believe God's Word, or is *Fides Divina*; and that the Covenant of Grace hath no Condition, and is made only with Christ, and that both obeyed and suffered in our Person in Law sence, so that we did in Law sence suffer in and by him, and yet fulfil all righteousness by him, and were reputatively sinless from first to last; that therefore we are justified by the Law of Innocency or Works that condemneth us, having perfectly kept it by Christ, that our works being not meritorious are not rewardable; Too many such Doctrines are Published here and abroad, by such as *Maccovius*, *Cluto*, *Cocceius* and some before them. And when Papists find one gross falshood, they think all our Religion is such.

§ XI. It greatly confirmeth Papists when they find our Writers falsely to accuse them, of any Doctrine which they hold not: which is very ordinarily done by those that never read them, on the meer credit of some Reverend Ministers that so accused them before; For instance, of the Point of Merit, when men read their Books of *Self-*
abnegation

abnegation, Annihilation, Self-abasing, and Nothingness, renouncing Merit, even in distributive Justice, &c. Some have wondered and said, How much further are the Papists from trusting to or boasting of their Merits, Works and Holiness than we are?

§ XII. But Protestants have no way promoted Popery more than by their manifold Divisions and Sects, and their mutual enmity and miscarriages. I need not name them. God hath made Unity and Concord so necessary and amiable to Man, that Nature and Grace abhor the contrary. Satan is the Divider of Christ's Kingdom: and a Kingdom divided cannot stand. Multitudes turn and continue Papists, not knowing where among so many Sects to fix their choice, especially when they see and hear us Revile, Censure, Silence, Imprison and Persecute one another as intolerable, they think they may do so by us all, and judge of us as we do by one another. And to vilifie us, is to value themselves. Which Sect, say they, would you have me turn to, if I turn?

§ XIII. Specially if we fall into odious Scandals as well as Sects, the Crimes of Men seem the fault of our Religion, When they have recited the Miscarriages here from 1642, till 1660. they think they have decided all the Controversies: And also when they can recite the *Munster* Madnes, and others such.

§ XIV. Hath the Silencing of Two thousand such Ministers, and shutting the Church Doors against desired Unity and Concord, and keeping out Candidates, and giving advantage to Papist Rulers to give full liberty for Popery, done nothing to its increase? What hath done more to advantage Popery, by disabling Protestants, and disgracing

gracing their Ministers of each Party, and keeping up the hopes of Foreign and Domestick Enemies, than casting the Nation into a kind of Intestine Hostility, and keeping it so by the Dividing Laws and Canons? which though it was principally the effects of secret Popish Projects, yet had no Anti-Papists by false Prejudice, Malice, Revenge and worldly-Interest, had a hand in the effecting, and since in defending it, they had been more innocent. And I would the Provocation had not driven many Nonconformists into harder thoughts of Bishops and Liturgy than they deserve, or than they had before the experience of their usage. But it's hard when for Innocency and Duty men must lye [and many die] in common Jails, and have all they have taken from them, and be left to Beggary or Charity, to keep up as great an esteem of the Authors or Abettors of such Hostility, as if they were men of Love and Peace. When they see men Hang'd for taking away a small part by Stealth or Robbery, it must be more than ordinary Patience and Love, that shall cause men to think and say no harm, even by honourable and Right Reverend men, that even by Law and Judgment said to be just, shall take away all, and much more than all. We had not procured hatred by our importunity in 1660 and 1661. in Pleading and Petitioning to prevent all this, if the certain foresight of it in its Causes, had not seem'd very dreadful to us: And yet we do not see the End: The Hostility continueth, if not increaseth, even while the Blood and Flames of *Germany, Hungary, Transilvania, Savoy, Flanders,* and *Ireland* and partly *Scotland*, loudly cry to us, *Fire, Fire;* and instead of avoiding the like, we are as busie as ever to bring more fewel, and

and increase the flame. And O dreadful odious Case ! All is as for God, and Religion and the Church, that is thus done against God, Religion, the Church and the whole Land & our Posterity.

§ XV. And by our several ways of Unjust and Causeless Impositions, we have hardened the Papists in defending their more numerous Snares. They say, If an Independent Church may bind its Members, to take their Covenants, to submit to their popular Examinations and Discipline, to avoid Communion with the Parish Churches, and not to forsake their Church but by tryed Reason or Consent : And if a Convocation may impose what is done in *England* on terms so sharp ; why may not the Pastors and Councils that have greater Charge and Power, do as much and more ?

§ XVI. The Sectarian weak-headed part of Protestants have greatly advantaged Popery, by their ignorant calling every Ceremony, and Form, and Opinion that they distaste, by the Name of *Antichristian* : and saying, O this is Popish, or taken out of the Mass-Book ; when some of them know not what *Antichristianity* is, saving as every Sin against Christ is *Antichristian*, nor know they what the Mass-Book is, nor what Popery is ; And it's well if some knew better what *Christianity* is.

When men hear that a Bishop, a Surplice, a sumptuous Church Edifice, a Ceremony, the Liturgies, a Holy-day (and it's well if not the use of the Creed and Lord's Prayer) be *Antichristian*, they are tempted to think that Popery called *Antichristianity* is no worse a thing than these ; and so honour Popery, and deride its Accusers.

I would these named were all the wrongs that Protestants have done to the Protestant Cause of

Reformation, and all that they have ignorantly done for Popery. But we hope our great Intercessor will procure forgiveness for them that know not what they do. But must the Church still suffer so much by its zealous Friends?

Chap. XIII. *What is the Duty of all other Christians towards the Papists in order to the Promoting of the Common Interest of Christianity?*

THOUGH I have distinctly answered this Question in the Second Part of my *Key for Catholics*, I will here answer it again, lest I be thought to run into Extreame, or encourage the Extreame of others; by all that I have here and elsewhere said. And as to the chat of Ignorant Faction, that will say I contradict my self, I will answer it with Contempt and Pity.

§ I. First, we must lay deep in our Minds, and inculcate on our Hearers the common Fundamental Truths and Duty: That Love is the Second great Commandment, like to the First: That it is the fulfilling of the Law: That he that dwells in Love dwells in God, and God in him: That he that loveth not his Brother whom he hath seen, loveth not God whom he never saw: That some love belongs to Enemies, and much more to Brethren: That as much as in us lyeth we must live peaceably with all Men: Yea, and follow Peace with all men.] And that these are Duties that nothing can dispense with.

§ II. We must acknowledge and commend all that is good among them; and must truly understand in what we are agreed: That is, They acknowledge all the same Books of Scripture to be the true Word of God which we acknowledge. They own all the Articles of the Creed which we own: and of the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Creed. They own all the Lord's Prayer, and all the Ten Commandments, saving that they take the Second to be but part of the First, and divide the Tenth into two. They teach in their Catechisms, all the Beatitudes, *Math. 5.* and the Moral Virtues, and the Graces of Faith, Hope and Love, &c. And he that practically and sincerely doth all this hath many Promises of Salvation in the Scripture.

§ III. We must not untruly fasten on them any Error which they hold not, nor put a false sence on their words, though we may find many Protestants that so charge them; nor may we charge that on the Party which is held but by some whom others contradict. How far many Protestants herein mistake and rashly wrong them (In the Doctrine of Predestination, Free-will, Grace, Merits, Justification, Redemption, Perseverance, &c.) I have freely shewed in my *Catholick Theology* and *End of Doctrinal Controversies*; And *Ludovicus le Blank* after others hath excellently opened.

§ IV. We must not take all the Laity to own all that the disputing Clergy write for; when they neither understand it nor consent to it.

§ V. As we must distinguish between the Essentials of Popery, and their Integrals or other Corruptions, so we must not charge any with the

first meerly for being guilty of many of the other : Else we must call all the *Greeks, Moscovites, Abassines, Armenians, &c. Papists.*

§ VI. We must still distinguish between *Christ's Catholick Church*, uniyed by his own Headship only; and the Papal Church, uniyed by a pretended Universal Humane Head, Monarchical or Aristocratical. And so we must distinguish between a *Christian* as such, and a *Papist* as such. And we must hold Communion with *Papists* in Christianity, though not in Popery; And must grant that those that hold *Christ's Headship* and Christianity more firmly and practically than the *Pope's Headship* and Popery, and seeing not the Contradiction, would renounce the Papacy if they saw it, may be saved.

§ VII. To profess utter averfeness to all Reconciliation with them, and to declare them no Christians but Antichristians, that must be the Objects only of our Hostility, is to be Adversaries to the first mentioned Fundamentals, and to the common interest of Peace and Christianity.

§ VIII. We must disclaim their opinion that say that the Church became Antichristian in 300, or 400, or 600, or any time before the *Popes* claimed Universal Jurisdiction over the Christian World, as well as in the Roman Empire. And then the Papal revolt did not reach one half the Church.

§ IX. We must not impute the Papal or Patriarchal Vices and Pride, to the generality of the inferior Bishops, though in Councils too many were very Factious : For even a Heathen *Amm. Marcellinus* tells us the great difference, by Papal Pride, and lower Bishops Humility and Virtue.

§ X. We must not take the Question, whether the Pope be Antichrist as more necessary than it is ; Nor make the Decision an Article of Faith, nor lay more of the stress of our difference on it than we ought : For we have many far clearer Arguments against them from plainer Scriptures.

§ XI. Therefore we must not force the vulgar to Disputes with Papists, without cause, on forced Expositions and Suppositions that turn the Revelations against *Rome* Papal as the *Babylon* and Antichrist there meant, when so much may be said, and is by some Protestants to make it likely that it is but *Rome* Pagan that is there meant. We must not give their Disputers the advantage of Challenging us before the Vulgar, to name one Man for a Thousand Years and more after Christ, that expounded the Revelation as we do, or that took the Pope to be Antichrist.

§ XII. We must not imitate the great Novel Expositors of the Revelation, that make the seven Churches to be seven States and Ages of the Universal Church, and two of them to be in the World to come after the Conflagration ; and consequently, that if by the *Angel* of each Church be meant the Bishop (either alone or with his Elders, as most think old and new Expositors) then an Universal Humane Head is of Gods Institution. And if that be true, then P pery will be right in its Essentials, and we in the wrong. We must take heed therefore of the ignorant factious Zeal of over-doers, that make men Papists by false opposing them.

§ XIII. We must take heed lest we make any one falshood a part of the Protestant Religion and Reformation (much less many plain falshoods

as too many do). For when Papists find any such Untruths, they will judge of our Religion in the main by those.

§ XIV. We must see that in the Form of our Government and Worship, we own not Principles of Confusion, and set not up our selves, our devised terms of Church Admittance and Communion, and thereby seem to justify such Additions among Papists and others.

§ XV. We must live in Love and Peace and Concord among our selves, that our Fractions, Sects, and Errours and envious Oppositions, make us not a scorn, and make not Papists think that we are mad, and that there is no way to Unity and Peace but in Popery, uniting under one Humane Head.

§ XVI. We must own Christian *Communion Indefinite*, and as Universal as Capacity alloweth, while we disown Universal Humane *Jurisdiction*. But we must understand well the difference.

We are *ex Authoritate Imperantis* bound to obey Jurisdiction: But to hold Agreements nothing binds us but God's general Commands for Peace and Concord, and our own Contract and the common good. So that if Councils agree on any thing contrary to these Ends, no Church is bound by such their Canons, nor to consent. Just as a Diet of Kings and States are free to consent or dissent to a Major Vote, as the reason of the thing requireth (and no further) for the common advantage of Christianity. But have no one King Universal to whom they are all Subjects.

§ XVII. Yet if any King and People will be so slavish as to subject themselves to a foreign King or Jurisdiction, their own consent may oblige them as far as Self-enslaving may do.

§ XVIII.

§ XVIII. We must not deny what good use God hath made of *Rome's* Grandure, Unity and Concord: It's like else Christianity had not kept up such advantages of strength, wealth and concord against the great Power of the Mahometan and Heathen Enemies.

§ XIX. We must not by the Scandals of some Persons or Fraternities, be drawn to think the rest are like them, nor to deny but such men as *Bernard, Gerson*, and abundance of Fryars, and Nuns, though zealous for the Roman Concord, were godly excellent Persons: Even in the dark Ages of their Church, what abundance of most learned School Doctors had they, in which much Piety also appeared (as in *Bonaventure, Aquinas, Henricus ab Hassia*, and many such. As also in many of their Bishops, as *Borromaus, Sales, &c.* And in the Oratorians, and many most Learned Jesuits. All this we must candidly confess and honour.

§ XX. The common Interest of Humanity, Christianity and God's foresaid fundamental Precepts, oblige Protestant and Papist Princes to Confederates how to live peaceably among themselves, and to unite against the Common Enemies, while they cannot yet agree in the Points of Difference. That so far as they are agreed, they may walk by the same rule.

§ XXI. I think we should hurt no Papist in Body or Goods, any further than is necessary to our own Defence, and the Defence of the Truth, and Souls of Men, and the Kingdoms safety. But win them by Love.

§ XXII. Because a factious Solicitation of the ignorant to submit to their foreign Jurisdiction, is
 enmity

enmity to Kings, and States, and Churches, as against their Essential Rights, the unpeaceable managing of Disputes and Endeavours to such Treason and Slavery, may be as much restrained by Law; as Men may be restrained from teaching that Wives must forsake their Husbands & lie with other Men, and Children forsake their Parents, and Soldiers their Kings and Captains, and all obey the Pope against them.

§ XXIII. Yet because they will say that we dare not hear the truth, I think it not amiss, if they be allowed some time, when the Rulers think fit (not to challenge weak Ministers at pleasure to Dispute) but in a fit Assembly to say what they can, so be it they will withal there hear what can be said against them, by some able Divine chosen by the King, Bishop or Ministers? who also should choose the time and place.

These terms are better than the unreconcilable Hostility kept up by the terms of *Antichrist* and *Heretick*.

• XXIV. And (though the unlearned have safer and better Books enough to read) I think it will do much to rectifie mens Judgments that are inclined to extreams, and to mellow and sweeten their hearts into Christian Love, if the Learned would read the Devotional Pious Writings of Papists; such as *Bernaud*, *Gerson*, *Gerhardus Zurphaniensis*, *Sales*, *Kempis*, *Thauleros*, *Benedictus de Benedictis Regula Vita*; *Barbanson*, *Ferrius*, the *Oratorians*, and in English, *The Interior Christian*, *Parsons of Resolution*, *Baker*, the *Life of Nerius*, and of *Mr. de Renti*, and other such.

They would find there so much of God as would win their affections to a Brotherly Kindness, while they

they find so much of that which is in themselves. Holy breathings after God, are savory to those that have the like. I know those that have read or heard such books as these, that have said, *How have we misunderstood the Papists?* If an esteemed Minister should Preach part of *The Interior Christian*. or such another book, and not tell his hearers *whose it was*, I doubt not but many godly people, would cry it up for a most excellent Sermon: When as if they before knew that it was a Papists they would run away.

I do not by any of this encourage any raw ungrounded Protestants to cast themselves on the Temptation of Popish Company or Books: But that you may see that I write not this rashly and without just cause, I will instance in one Book called *Bunnys Resolution*; It was written by *Parsons*, one accounted a most traiterous Jesuite, and *Edmund Bunny* Corrected and Published it; (and *Parsons* Reprinted it with more Popery, reviling *Bunney* for being so bold with his Book, as to sponge out the Popish Errours. I have met with several eminent Christians that magnified the good they had received by that Book.

When I was 21 years of Age, the Bishops severity against Private Meeting caused many excellent Christians in *Shrewsbury* to meet secretly for mutual Edification: At one of these where was of Ministers *Mr. Cradock*, *Mr. Rich. Simonds*, and *Mr. Fawler* (cast out at *Bridewell Church* since) *Mr. Simonds* said, that there were some godly women in great doubt of the sincerity of their Conversion, because they knew not the Time, Means and Manner of it, and desired all that were willing to open the case of their own, to satisfie
such

such. I remember but one that could tell just the Time, *Means* and Manner, but with most it began early, and was brought on by slow degrees; but so as some *One Time* and *Means* made a more observable change than any other: Among these three spake their own case, that after many Convictions, and a love to Piety, the first lively motion that awakened their Souls to a serious resolved care of their Salvation, was the reading of *Bunnys* Book of Resolution: These three were Mr. *Fawler*, Mr. *Michael Old* (for Zeal known through much of *England*) and *my self*. And having since heard of the same success with others, (when yet now there be many Books that I had rather read) I have reason to think that God notified his will, that we should (instead of rash hatred) profit by each other, and love his Word whoever writeth it.

§ XXV. And we are the more obliged to behave our selves with all due tenderness to Papists and all other exasperated parties, in the Consciousness of the aforesaid guilt that we have fallen under, to their hardening and hurt. Weakening the Protestants is strengthening the Papists. Repentance is so hard a work, that it seldom goeth well down with any party to hear of their sins, especially the most heinous, because they are most frightful and odious. But yet it is so necessary a work to Repent, necessary to the sinners, and necessary to this Land, that a Dying Minister of Christ (who daily lamenteth his own sin) should not for fear of the anger or reviling of the impenitent, omit so necessary a work, while *Danger* and yet *Hope* seem to tell us that *this is the time*.

Having oft done it to the displeasing of many,

I will, though it yet displease, add this brief warning.

If the remembrance of the years 1643 to 1660. of all that was done in *England, Wales* and *Scotland*, against Order, Peace, Government, Ministry, sound Doctrine and Discipline, by the Sectarian Army and the Antinomian, Anabaptist and Separating Ministers and People that encouraged them, and the fatal end they came to without any bloodshed to overcome them, and the consequent changes : I say if all this convince not the Separating Sectarian sort of professors, that they have been heinously injurious to the Protestant interest, and have ignorantly kept up the life of Popish hopes, I know not what means can convince such men.

II. And if after all the Miseries of former divisions and uncharitable violence, before and in the Wars, those that have added the greater burdens, and revengefully done what I love not so oft to mention, by Laws, execution and additional reproach, upon Corporations, Churches, Universities, Ministers, and brought and yet keep the Land by resolved obstinacy, in its divided dangerous sinful state, and lock up their Church door against desired Unity and Concord, and all this for nothing, but to justify the revengeful changers and their own complying acts, I say again, and again, if all this after the last thirty years experience added to all before, seem to the guilty no wrong to the Protestant interest, nor to the Nations Peace and Hopes, nor any advantage to Popery, nor any sin against Christ in his Servants, the Lord take some extraordinary effectual way, to convince, heal and save so blind and obdurate a people : for I see no hope of ordinary means.

The

The God of Peace have mercy upon an Ignorant Un-peaceable World, and prepare us by Faith, Hope and Love for the World of Love and Peace. Amen.

Postscript.

§ 1. **I** Perceive some cannot digest it, that a Christian Sovereign should be the Head, that is, the *Forma informans, specifica & unifica* of a National Church, and that it is not said to be a National Sacerdotal Head, either Monarchical in one primæ or Aristocratical in several Metropolitanes or Diocefanes, as one College & *Persona politica*; Or as Mr. Hooker, Dr. Beveridge, and the Republicane Politicians, and most fanaticks think, in the Major part of the Body, ruling by their Representatives and chosen Proxies, which is called a Democracy; or mixt of these by natural right.

§ 2. And if any thing with these men were strange, it would seem strange, that the same men that subscribe to or approve the Canons of 1640 for the *Divine making* or institution of Kings and that fill Pulpits and Books with Invectives against Rebels Fanaticks and the Parliaments Wars, and many Writers of Politicks, for holding that the King is *singulis Major & universis Minor*, and that the Power of the Head is from the Majority of the Body, and that the Legislative Supremacy is in them radically as in the *Majestas Realis* derived to the King as the *Majestas personalis*, should come themselves to build their Church Power on so rotten a foundation; And that the poor Nonconformists

formists long called Rebellious, must now become against such Churchmen the defenders of the Sovereigns Power. But such is the case of this blind, giddy, factious World.

§ 3. According to my usual (despised) method, I will distinguish the Controversie *de re*, from that *de nomine* : And I may say.

That *de re* all men are agreed of all these following things.

1. That Civil Power *in genere* is of Gods institution : and his Laws made their supreme Law, and his Will and Glory their ultimate end.

2. That as all are thus bound, so Christian Sovereigns are both bound and qualified as from God, and for God, and therefore are sacred persons.

3. That the forcing power of the Sword is only committed to Magistrates; to be exercised FOR and UNDER GOD, and by Christians *for* & under Jesus Christ ; And therefore such Christian Princes are not to be called *Civil*, as exclusive of Religious or Spiritual work, but as exercising their power *pro civibus*, for the good of their Kingdoms, even religious.

4. That God is the Author or institutor also of the Sacerdotal Office ; and hath specify'd it in his Word : And that the Magistrate or the sacred Ministry, can neither of them put down each other, nor alter any part of either Office which God hath instituted.

5. That it belongeth to the Sacerdotal Office (or Clergy) to be the official Preachers of the Gospel, and to judge by the Power of the Keys, who is fit, or unfit, for Church entrance by Baptism, and for Church Communion, and to Baptize, and administer the Lords Supper, admonish,
suspend

suspend and excommunicate from their communion, such as deserve it, and to absolve the Penitent.

6. That the Priesthood (or Pastors) have no power to use the Sword, by force, (on Body or Estate, by Stripes or Mulcts) nor yet to force or require the Magistrate to do Execution by the meer Sentence of the Clergy, without trying and judging the Cause himself.

7. The Pastors that the Magistrate chuseth for the care of his Soul, may declare him unfit for Communion if by impenitency in gross scandal he deserve it; but may not disable him from Government, by a publick dishonouring Excommunication; much less send such a reproach abroad in the Land or World.

8. The Bishops, and all the National Clergy are Subjects to the Sovereign, as Physicians and Philosophers &c. are. And he is Governour over them in matters of Religion which belong to the determination of National Laws, as well as in worldly things. The Pastor as the Physician is judge *judicio privato personali* how to use his own Art and Work, and when, and on whom: But the King is Judge *judicio publico* of all that is to be the common Rule: As that Physicians use no Poysonous Drugs, take not too great Fees, what Hospital he shall be over, &c. And so for the Ministry, that they preach not Heresie, or Schism, and Strife, that they neglect not their Work, that they use a fit Translation of the Bible, that they have due Maintenance, Place, &c.

9. The Sovereign is Judge whether his Christian Kingdom shall be divided into Provinces, Diocesses, and of what extent they shall be, or shall

shall have one Primate, or all particular Churches shall be equal ; or some Tolerated and Priviledged from the Diocesans.

10. The King may make publick Laws for Family Religion, that all Children be taught to read, and learn Catechisms, and Scripture, and use the Lords day in pious Exercises, and submit to their Teachers, and forbear profane contempt or abuse of Persons or Things.

I think the whole Matter is decided in these ten Particulars.

§ 4. II. Now *de nomine* the question is what is to be called the FORM, and what but the MATTER of the Church as National. For of a Church as *Congregational*, or as *Diocesan*, or a *Provincial* we have no controverſie : No more than of a City or School.

And ſeeing every Politick Society conſiſteth of the *Pars Imperans* and *Pars Subdiſa*, all grant that the *Pars Imperans* as related to the *Pars Subdiſa*, is the *Specifying* or *Unifying Form* and *Head* ; it is then clear that all the Clergy being but the *Pars Subdiſa* under the Government of the *ſumma poteſtas* (whether Kings alone, or King and Parliament, or an Ariſtocracy) they can be but the *Matter* of the Church as *National*, and not the *Formal Head* : For a Body Politick of one Species, can have but one Head of that Species. So that to make a *Primate*, or two *Metropolitans*, or a *Synod* of *Diocesans*, or a *Convocation* representing all the Clergy, to be more than the *Matter* of a Church as *National*, is to make them the *ſumma poteſtas* or *Sovereign*, and to depoſe King and Parliament.

§ 5. Obj. But the Regiments being of two Species,
N n

suspend and excommunicate from their communion, such as deserve it, and to absolve the Penitent.

6. That the Priesthood (or Pastors) have no power to use the Sword, by force, (on Body or Estate, by Stripes or Mulcts) nor yet to force or require the Magistrate to do Execution by the meer Sentence of the Clergy, without trying and judging the Cause himself.

7. The Pastors that the Magistrate chuseth for the care of his Soul, may declare him unfit for Communion if by impenitency in gross scandal he deserve it; but may not disable him from Government, by a publick dishonouring Excommunication; much less send such a reproach abroad in the Land or World.

8. The Bishops, and all the National Clergy are Subjects to the Sovereign, as Physicians and Philosophers &c. are. And he is Governour over them in matters of Religion which belong to the determination of National Laws, as well as in worldly things. The Pastor as the Physician is judge *judicio privato personali* how to use his own Art and Work, and when, and on whom: But the King is Judge *judicio publico* of all that is to be the common Rule: As that Physicians use no Poysonous Drugs, take not too great Fees, what Hospital he shall be over, &c. And so for the Ministry, that they preach not Heresie, or Schism, and Strife, that they neglect not their Work, that they use a fit Translation of the Bible, that they have due Maintenance, Place, &c.

9. The Sovereign is Judge whether his Christian Kingdom shall be divided into Provinces, Diocesses, and of what extent they shall be, or shall

shall have one Primate, or all particular Churches shall be equal ; or some Tolerated and Priviledged from the Diocesans.

10. The King may make publick Laws for Family Religion, that all Children be taught to read, and learn Catechisms, and Scripture, and use the Lords day in pious Exercises, and submit to their Teachers, and forbear profane contempt or abuse of Persons or Things.

I think the whole Matter is decided in these ten Particulars.

§ 4. II. Now *de nomine* the question is what is to be called the FORM, and what but the MATTER of the Church as National. For of a Church as *Congregational*, or as *Diocesan*, or a *Provincial* we have no controversie : No more than of a City or School.

And seeing every Politick Society consisteth of the *Pars Imperans* and *Pars Subdita*, all grant that the *Pars Imperans* as related to the *Pars Subdita*, is the *Specifying* or *Unifying Form* and *Head* ; it is then clear that all the Clergy being but the *Pars Subdita* under the Government of the *summa potestas* (whether Kings alone, or King and Parliament, or an Aristocracy) they can be but the *Matter* of the Church as *National*, and not the *Formal Head* : For a Body Politick of one Species can have but one Head of that Species. So that to make a *Primate*, or two *Metropolitans*, or a *Synod* of *Diocesans*, or a *Convocation* representing all the Clergy, to be more than the *Matter* of a Church as *National*, is to make them the *summa potestas* or *Sovereign*, and to depose King and Parliament.

§ 5. Obj. But the Regiment being of two Species,

N n

70

so is the Policy, Society and Supremacy: Each is Supreme in sua specie.

Ans. 1. So then you would have two National Churches and Sovereigns: If you'll extend the Controversie but to the Name, it may be the better born: But then acknowledge the Equivocation, and give us the definition of each Church, and use not the Name of the Church of England for your own Form only.

2. But a Subject Policy is not the Supreme and denominating Policy: It's private and subordinate as to National. The Physicians, the Soldiers, the Marriners, &c. though they are *in hoc* fit to over-rule the King and Parliament, are not therefore the Sovereign Power of the National Body Politick.

§ 6. Obj. But theirs are matters of small moment, but the Clergy are Rulers in matters of Salvation.

Ans. Unhappy dividing Rulers they have been here and in most of the Churches. But, 1. I have proved that Kings are Rulers also in matters of Salvation as great as theirs, and over them: 2. Was not Moses, and David, and Solomon, and Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah, and Josiah, &c. the Sovereign Rulers of Church and Priests, though an Uzziah might not offer Sacrifice or Incense? 3. The proper Governing power of Bishops is but over their own Flocks, and they may not Rule in other Mens Diocesses, much less over King, Parliament and Kingdom, further than the Sovereign giveth them Political Power.

§ 7. Obj. They may command Kings and Kingdoms in Christ's Name to obey God and forbear Sin.

Ans. True; so did every Prophet; so may any one Minister: Yea a Foreigner, a Salvian, a Luther,

ther, &c. But this is *Gods Government Nunciative*, and not *Political*: And so if the Metropolitans, Diocesans, Convocation or a General Council command as in Christs Name, and prove their Commission as *Messengers* from him, we will obey Christ in them: But if one Man bring better proof from Scripture that he speaketh from Christ, he is to be obeyed before a Council that proveth no such thing. This sort of *Divine Authority* lyeth in *Evidence* (which most Bishops on Earth now have not) of the truth of their Message, and is but *Nunciative*, and worketh only on *voluntary Believers and Consenters*.

And if the Controversie *de nomine* be whether a *Christian Kingdom* as such may be called A CHURCH what pretence have the deniers? Not a *notatione nominis*: The Church in the Wilderness is a Scripture Name: And sure the Jews Church was not denominated from the Priests only: *Moses* is often named as its Head than *Aaron*.

§ 8. Obj. But are not Judges and Bishops a part of the *Pars Imperans* as well as the Sovereign.

Ans. Only subordinate in their Provinces: They are but as the *Kings Hands and Tongue*. They are Subjects themselves, and have no Political Power but what he giveth them.

2. If you might so far distinguish of them as *Imperant* under the King and as Subjects, as to say that Judges and Bishops are as the *Wife* in the Family that hath a Governing power over Children and Servants. that maketh her not the *denominating Head* of the Family, but a *Subject* of the highest Rank.

§ 9. Qu. What if a Christian Kingdom had no Pastors?

Ans. Then they were but an *Embrio*, or half *Christian*, and not *materia disposita* for a full formation. The *Matter* and *Privation* (that is, *Dispositio receptiva*) are *Essential* to the *Body*, though they be not the *Form*.

10. *Qu.* But what if under an *Infidel King*, a *Christian Nation* be confederate under *Bishops*.

Ans. They are no *Christian Kingdoms*, but a *Christian Nation*, and are many confederate *Churches*, and may be called *One Church* equivocally and *secundum quid* as confederate *Kingdoms* may be one *Kingdom*: But they are but *materia disposita sine forma* as to a *National Church* properly so called, and as such,

§ 11. *Qu.* Are those of the *Church of England* that are not *Conformists*?

Yes, if they conform to *Christianity*, and are *Subjects* of the same *King*.

§ 12. There is an odd *Writer* that hath lately published a book to prove that the *Act of Toleration* freeth not *Nonconformists* from the guilt of *Schism*. Doleful is the case of such a *Church* and *Land*, where the *Learned men* after near thirty years silencing, imprisoning, and ruining multitudes, know not to this day what they are, or what they hold, and who it is that they do all this against. How can such wink so hard as not to know that we took it for no *Schism* to assemble for *Gods Worship* before the *Act of Toleration*, while they have done all this against us for so doing? Could they think us so mad as to suffer *Jails* and *Ruine* and *Scorn* (and *Death* to many,) for known *Schism*? And if we took it for a duty before, how can we take the *Act of Toleration* to be it that must justify us?

But

But such men *England* suffers by, that cannot distinguish between *Forum Divinum* and *Humanum*: We believe that Gods Command justifieth us *in foro Divino*, for obeying it: But the Law justifieth us *in foro humano*: Gods Law and Judgment will keep us from Hell, and at last silence our silencers: But the Kings Laws bring us and keep us out of Jails, and from the Jaws of them that envy our Liberty and Lives.

§ 13. It's a question considerable, whether *England* be a Protestant Church or not, if it have a Papist King? To which I say, we must distinguish between a profest Papist and a concealed one.
 2. And between a King that hath the total Sovereignty and Legislative Power, and one that hath but part of it, and the Parliament another part.
 3. And one whose Laws are for Popery (or his power above Laws used by Commission) and one who ruleth by Protestant Laws. And so

1. A Kingdom under a total Popish Sovereignty, ruling by Popish Laws or Mandates above Law, is no Political Protestant National Church, tho all the Clergy were Protestants: The form that denominateth is Papal: And yet it is not a Papal Church or Kingdom: Because the *matter* is essential, and its *disposition* without which *non recipitur forma*. It is a *Christian Church*, neither Protestant (save equivocally) nor Papist, but mixt.

But if Bishop *Morley* and those Conformists that give the total Legislation and Sovereignty to the King alone be not in the right, nor they that make it traiterous to suppose that the Kings Authority speaking by Law, may be set against his Personal Will, Word and Commission, then the Parliament and Laws remaining Protestant, the Kingdom

Ans. Then they were but an *Embrio*, or half *Christian*, and not *materia disposita* for a full formation. The *Matter* and *Privation* (that is, *Dispositio receptiva*) are *Essential* to the *Body*, though they be not the *Form*.

10. Qu. But what if under an *Infidel King*, a *Christian Nation* be confederate under *Bishops*.

Ans. They are no *Christian Kingdoms*, but a *Christian Nation*, and are many confederate *Churches*, and may be called *One Church* equivocally and *secundum quid* as confederate *Kingdoms* may be one *Kingdom*: But they are but *materia disposita sine forma* as to a *National Church* properly so called, and as such,

§ 11. Qu. Are those of the *Church of England* that are not *Conformists*?

Yes, if they conform to *Christianity*, and are *Subjects of the same King*.

§ 12. There is an odd *Writer* that hath lately published a book to prove that the *Act of Toleration* freeth not *Nonconformists* from the guilt of *Schism*. Doleful is the case of such a *Church and Land*, where the *Learned men* after near thirty years silencing, imprisoning, and ruining multitudes, know not to this day what they are, or what they hold, and who it is that they do all this against. How can such wink so hard as not to know that we took it for no *Schism* to assemble for *Gods Worship* before the *Act of Toleration*, while they have done all this against us for so doing? Could they think us so mad as to suffer *Jails and Ruine and Scorn* (and *Death* to many,) for *known Schism*? And if we took it for a duty before, how can we take the *Act of Toleration* to be it that must justify us?

But

But such men *Englan.* suffers by, that cannot distinguish between *Form Divinum* and *Humanum*: We believe that Gods Command justifieth us *in foro Divino*, for obeying it: But the Law justifieth us *in foro humano*: Gods Law and Judgment will keep us from Hell, and at last silence our silencers: But the Kings Laws bring us and keep us out of Jails, and from the Jaws of them that envy our Liberty and Lives.

§ 13. It's a question considerable, whether *England* be a Protestant Church or not, if it have a Papist King? To which I say, we must distinguish between a profest Papist and a concealed one.

2. And between a King that hath the total Sovereignty and Legislative Power, and one that hath but part of it, and the Parliament another part.

3. And one whose Laws are for Popery (or his power above Laws used by Commission) and one who ruleth by Protestant Laws. And so

1. A Kingdom under a total Popish Sovereignty, ruling by Popish Laws or Mandates above Law, is no Political Protestant National Church, tho all the Clergy were Protestants: The form that denominateth is Papal: And yet it is not a Papal Church or Kingdom: Because the *matter* is essential, and its *disposition* without which *non recipitur forma*. It is a *Christian Church*, neither Protestant (save equivocally) nor Papist, but mixt.

But if Bishop *Morley* and those Conformists that give the total Legislation and Sovereignty to the King alone be not in the right, nor they that make it traitorous to suppose that the Kings Authority speaking by Law, may be set against his Personal Will, Word and Commission, then the Parliament and Laws remaining Protestant, the Kingdom

dom and Church may yet be so called, though not in the fullest sence. For then the Laws being the Kings publick voice, and the effect of a Power above his own alone, by them tho' he be a Papist he Ruleth as a Protestant. But it is otherwise if his Commissions (e. g. to the French or Irish to Invade the Land) be above Law, and may not be resisted on any pretence whatsoever: So great a stress lieth on this point of Conformity.

§ 14. But I will leave another case to the consideration of others. if Metropolitans, or Primates, if Diocesans or Convocations, be the *summa Potestas, Ecclesiastica*, and a Church be truly *Societas Politica*, or governed; *Q^{ua}*. Then what Religion was the Diocesan Church of Gloucester, while Godfrey Goodman was Bishop? Or the Diocesan Churches of Eli, of Norwich, of Oxford, &c. while Dr. Gunning, Dr. Sparrow, Dr. Parker, &c. were Bishops? Or the Church of England and Ireland, while Dr. Laud, Dr. Neale were here the Metropolitans, and Dr. Bromhall Primate of Ireland.

§ 15. As to the Learned Dr. (now Bishop) Stillingfleet, that maketh the Church of England to have no visible Informing Constitutive Head or Sovereign, but to be Governed by meer Consent of men Agreeing in a Convocation representing the whole body, I am sorry I have said heretofore so much against it; as if the Consent of all Writers of Politicks regardable, had not been answer enough, who agree that all Politick bodies are essentiated by the *Pars Imperans*, or *summa Potestas*, and the *Pars subdita*, as the *Materia disposita*: And I so much honour the National Church of England, as that I shall not yet grant (till it is further deformed) That It is no Political Body, but a meer Confederating

ring Community, like a Confederacy of Kingdoms.

But if ever it come to that, you may say, that when the same Land hath many sorts of Confederate Clergies, it hath as many Churches; and which is the best, I think is not known in *France*, or *Spain*, or *Italy*, or here by the *Major Vote*; nor hath Nature put a Ruling Authority in *Major Votes* of Lay or Clergy, as born with them, before Contract give it them by Political Constitution.

All's well in Heaven: The Lord fit us for it.

March 30. 1691.

Since the writing of all this I have read Bishop *Stillingsfleet's* excellent Charge to his Clergy; which would give me hope not only of the continuance of the Protestant Reformation here, but also of such a further Reformation as may procure our Concord, or at last move the Law-makers, so far to amend the Act of Uniformity as may procure it; were it not that the deluge of the wickedness in City and Countrey, and the paucity of Men qualified for his described Work, and the Power and Number of the Enemies of it, maketh me fear that it will die as unpracticable singularity.

But I humbly recommend to the Clergy the regard especially of these passages in it. I. Pag. 12. 'Those that have the smallest Cures are called
' PASTORS, and *Linwood* notes that *Parochialis*
' *Sacerdos dicitur Pastor*, and that not only by way
' of Allusion, but in respect to the Cure of Souls;
' but we need not go so far back: What are they
' admitted to? Is it not *ad Curam Animarum*?'
Ask Dr. Fuller Dean of *Lincoln*, then, Whether it
be Ministerial Truth to publish that *Parochus* was ne-
ver

ver called Pastor, till the deliration of this and the former Age.]

II. Pag. 25. [" I hope they are now convinced that the Persecution which they complained lately so much of, was carried on by other Men, and for other design, than they would then seem to believe.]

I am glad that you are convinced of it. You are mistaken in us; we believed it ever since 1660. But we know that it was *Sheldon, Morley, Gunning, Hinchman, Sparrow*, and many more such that were the great Agents of it, in Court, Convocation, and Parliament. I thank you for disowning it.

III. I rejoice to find it proved, Pag. 37. that *The Bishop is judge of the fitness of any Clerk presented to a Benefice,*] which as it puts us in some (faint) hopes for the future, so for the time past it tells the Bishops whose the guilt is of the Institution of all the incapable Clergy.

IV. Pag. 40. He proveth that Visitations should be Parochial.

V. He comfortably purposeth to reduce Confirmation to its true use: And tells Ministers their Duty of Certifying the Receivers fitness.

VI. In a word, I intreat the Reader to compare this Charge, with the Visitation Articles of Bishop *Wren*, *Pierce*, and such others; and the Charge against them in Parliament, and observe the difference, and be thankful for so much.

April 3. 1691.



in-

n-
n-
er
ld

ou
nce
ey,
ch
on-
dif-

hat
nt-
nt)
elks
of

ons

on-
neir

om-
s of
the
rve

x